

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME XVI

OCTOBER, 1923

NUMBER 4

NATURAL RELIGION; CONSCIOUSNESS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS¹

JAMES BISSETT PRATT

WILLIAMS COLLEGE

EIGHTEEN years ago, when Emerson Hall was nearing its completion, the motto chosen for its portal was that insistent query of the psalmist, "What is man that Thou art mindful of him?" No words could have been more appropriate for a building devoted to philosophy and psychology; and if we knew the answer to the question they propound we should have at least the key to the more fundamental problems of Natural Religion.

Early in the history of Christian thought St. Augustine formulated the two most fundamental of these problems. "Deum et animam," he wrote, "scire cupido. Nihilne plus? Nihil omnino." God and the soul, then — or (as we today should be more likely to put it) God and man, form the subject matter of the two great problems of Natural Religion. They are closely interlinked and interdependent; so closely interlinked, in fact, that it is impossible to treat of one without involving oneself in implications as to the other. Yet for the sake of clearness it has always been found necessary to treat of them separately. The emphasis of Natural Religion during the past has usually been upon the problem of God, his existence, his nature, his purposes, and his relation to the world. Today we are less confident in our power to deal directly with these great themes. I, at any rate, utterly distrust my ability to attack successfully the problem, What is God? and shall feel more sanguine of

¹ The annual Dudleian Lecture, delivered in Emerson Hall, Harvard University, April 3, 1923. The direction of the Founder (1751) is: "The first lecture or anniversary sermon to be for the proving, explaining, and proper use and improvement of the principles of Natural Religion, as it is commonly called and understood by divines and learned men."

reaching some real insight into the questions with which natural religion deals if I confine myself to the humbler approach, and seek with you the answer to the psalmist's more modest question, "What is man?"

To this question there are two obvious replies. "A little lower than the angels," says the psalmist — crowned with glory and honor, with all things under his feet. A little higher than the brutes, replies natural science — sprung from them not long ago and inheriting still most of their nature. Far apart as these answers seem, they may both be true. They are not really inconsistent; for the being that evolved but yesterday from the brutes and who is as yet in many ways very like them, may be already well upon the upward path and at least in promise and potency only a little lower than the angels. This would be a mediating view and also in a sense a dualistic view, for it would find in man two natures, which the biblical nomenclature of our predecessors would have called the earthly and the heavenly. For though it is conceivable that the two may somehow ultimately be taken up into a supreme unity, short of that ultimate cosmic unity the brute's nature and the angel's, the earthly and the heavenly, are certainly two; and not merely are they two — they are in some ways antithetical and often found in deadly conflict.

Those to whom all dualism is anathema will, therefore, have nothing to do with this mediating position, but still insist either that man is all from heaven or all from earth, with no mingling of different principles in his nature. So far as I know, the former of these extreme monistic views has never been held; no one has regarded man as already full-formed angel with no smirch of the earth upon him. The psalmist himself puts man at least a *little* lower than the angels. And Genesis tells us that in the beginning he was made from clay. But the other extreme view has often been taken — is, in fact, the increasingly popular belief of our day, at least in circles that call themselves scientific. It is the view of Naturalism. For it is the aim of naturalism to reduce all beings and all activities to one type of being and one type of change; and the type of being and of change which it takes as fundamental and to which it would

reduce all others is that made familiar to us in natural science. It is no idle impulse that has led to the construction of this ideal. The great practical aim of science — in pursuit of which man has conquered the earth and subdued the elements — has been to enable us to know what to expect from nature. Science has worked out a system of physical concepts and laws by the application of which we are able to foresee the course of physical changes and the consequences of physical conditions. That all changes and the consequences of all conditions should be subject to the same laws, that all reality should be capable of being written down and described under one set of formulae is, indeed, not an hypothesis of science; but that many a courageous scientific mind should make this postulate was almost inevitable. The postulate is a bold one, and the desire to test it thoroughly and if possible to prove it is a worthy ambition. And no one can deny that naturalism has gone much farther in verifying its hypothesis than most of our ancestors would have supposed possible. Material nature has been unified under the naturalistic formula; and man has been shown to be in large measure a product and a part of nature.

But the question is still to be settled: Is man wholly a part and product of nature? Much of him doubtless is. All of him, of course, is, if we take nature in the widest sense as including all reality, as in Shakespeare's lines,

Nature is made better by no mean
But nature makes that mean.

This, however, is not the meaning of the word nature which naturalism attributes to it; for naturalism aims to be more than mere tautology. If naturalism is right, man and all there is to him is ultimately to be explained, and completely explained, in terms of the physical and the mechanical. The question, therefore, still remains open: Is such an explanation really adequate? Is man wholly a product and a part of physical nature, or is there in him an additional element which cannot be described in naturalistic terms nor evolved out of naturalism's monistic formula? Here is the real issue.

Plainly the issue centres about consciousness and personality. Can consciousness, in its lower and its higher forms, be in-

cluded within the formulae of naturalism? Can personality be so analyzed as to be statable in terms of chemistry, physics, and mechanics? As you will see, these questions, with their necessary correlates, stretch out almost endlessly into the world of thought, and involve two-thirds of contemporary philosophical discussion. To be more specific, they involve the three great problems of the nature of consciousness and its relation to its object, the relation of consciousness to the body, especially to the brain, and the nature of the self. To discuss three such complex problems with any detail in one lecture is, of course, out of the question. I do, however, hope to show in a general way the sort of position which monistic naturalism takes and must take on these three problems, together with the consequences which must necessarily follow from the acceptance and from the denial of these naturalistic views.

If consciousness be something different in kind from the physical, it is plainly going to be difficult to make man — and for that matter even the animals — fit into a formula which avoids all dualism by basing itself ultimately upon the physical alone. All the greater will be this difficulty if knowledge be considered in the traditional fashion as involving a subjective and an objective factor — a relation, let us say, between a mind and its object, a relation of such a sort that in knowing the mind transcends its own immediate psychic states, *means* more than it experiences, refers to more than it directly senses, and grasps in intention the distant in space and the absent in time. One would search in vain through the files of naturalism for a formula that could include such a power; and if the mind really possesses it — is able really to have knowledge in this sense — it is going to be extraordinarily difficult to derive the mind of man from physical nature without the addition of any new element. Hence we find the two great schools of epistemology which are most sympathetic with naturalism attempting to build up an entirely new view of knowledge and even denying the existence of consciousness in the ordinary sense altogether; attempting, in short, to do away with the subjective aspect of experience and to substitute for the older philosophical view a kind of pan-objectivism.

This attempt to do away with the unique nature of knowledge and with the subjective in general sometimes takes the form of interpreting consciousness as a unique kind of control over behavior — a control exerted by the environment. This control is brought about by a peculiar kind of stimulus, namely, one that has a peculiar kind of incompleteness or reference to the future. Thus a sound-wave, in addition to its physical characteristics, has the additional quality of causing the hearer to cock the ear and turn the eyes and set on foot activities which are directed toward getting a better stimulus. This quality, we are told, *is* consciousness. Consciousness, therefore, is not something different from the physical, something inner and subjective. It is the peculiar quality of a stimulus by virtue of which the environment is enabled to control behavior by reference to the future. There is nothing, therefore, in man's consciousness or his knowledge to prevent him from being described wholly in naturalistic terms — a conclusion surely beyond cavil once we accept the definition of consciousness suggested.

But to found a philosophical view upon the invention of a new definition for an old word is to build a house upon the sand. One may, of course, define one's words as one likes, and if one wishes to define consciousness as a peculiar quality of a peculiar stimulus one may do so — though it will be admitted, I think, that the definition is a bit peculiar. But after one has disposed of "consciousness" in this neat and simple way, the really important question is still to be answered as to how we shall deal with those indubitable experiences which are not qualities of physical stimuli — pains, pleasures, memories, intentions, images, meanings, processes of will and of attention. It is these that press for interpretation, and it is equally idle to assert that they are qualities of physical stimuli, or to evade them by a new and arbitrary definition of the word "consciousness."

The other method by which it is sought to make consciousness and knowledge consistent with naturalistic monism is much more ingenious and persuasive. It consists, namely, in analyzing consciousness and its processes into content, and identifying this content either with bodily processes or (in the

case of perception and knowledge) with the objects to which consciousness is commonly said to refer. Psychic states thus turn out to be identical with physical objects and physical objects are identical with psychic states, except for their order of arrangement or mode of collection. In fact, taken in themselves, objects are neither psychical nor physical, they are neutral; and we call a given object psychical or physical purely because of the collection with which it is related in reference to our judgment. This watch is in itself, like all things else, neutral; but as a part of that collection of things to which my nervous system responds it is called psychical; as one of the things in this room it is physical. Thus both matter in the old sense and mind in the old sense are banished. Reality is a collection of neutral entities and there is nothing in it that is really subjective. Ideas and mental processes in the old sense are done away with, and thus the world is one in substance and one in the laws of its workings.

We must look a little further to get the full meaning of this doctrine. It means, for one thing, that all mental processes and attitudes — such as those we experience in an effort of will or of attention or in the attitude of belief — consist in sensations and images or are to be identified with physiological processes. Such an experience, for example, as believing or meaning or intending is to be construed not as the *feeling* of a bodily process, but as identically the bodily process itself; or else it is to be interpreted as a succession of sensuous images — images which even the chief exponent of this doctrine, Mr. Bertrand Russell, admits that neither he nor anyone else has ever been able to find by analysis, but which for entirely non-empirical reasons *must* somehow constitute all mental processes.

The theory of knowledge and of consciousness we are considering takes, moreover, a rather interesting position on the question of the process found in perception. Physiological psychologists assure us that your percept of this watch is brought about by the reflection of ether waves from its surface to your retina and by processes which are thereupon set up in your optic nerve and eventually in your brain. Either immediately after this brain-event or concomitantly with it, a percept

is born which we call a percept of the watch. Now the doctrine we are examining, which would abolish the subjective by identifying psychic content with its object, is bound to hold that the percept and the watch are one and the same, in spite of the fact that the watch started the whole process which ended with the percept, and in spite of the fact that between the two are intercalated the entire physical and physiological series of the events of the perceptive process.

Not only shall we get into trouble with physiological psychology if we accept this doctrine, but we shall also be forced to do astonishing things with the spatial and temporal characters of all things and all events. For if my visual image of this watch be identical with the watch and your visual image of the watch be also the watch, then it would seem that your image and mine are identical with each other, in spite of the fact that my image is several times as large as yours, much more vivid, and of an entirely different shape. The only way we could get out of this manifest contradiction would be by asserting that the watch is not anywhere in particular but that it is actually everywhere. In other words, every object would have to be identified with all its actual and all its possible appearances at any and every angle, and any and every distance, each object being thus exploded to the extremest bounds of space, and interpenetrating with every other object in the universe. In similar fashion events would have to be exploded to the extremes of time—both future and past. For the perception of an event—for example our perception of the reflection of light from a star—plainly occurs at a time subsequent to the event perceived; the physical and physiological processes involved take time. Even more obviously is it true that memory, anticipation, and the conceptual references we make to the past and the future occur at points in the time-series very different from the events which we remember, anticipate, and refer to—as when, for example, we think of the battle of Marathon, 2413 years ago. There is nothing particularly difficult about this if we recognize subjective conscious states in the old and usual way, as different from their objects, and if we admit that in knowing or meaning its objects the mind transcends in intention its immediate content.

But such admissions are of course just the things which the pan-objective view that we are considering is most bound to refuse. Hence it finds great difficulty in the temporal facts I have just cited — namely, that perception, memory, and conceptual reference occur at different times from the events to which they refer. How, for example, can my present thought of the death of Socrates or of the end of the world be identical with its objects — separated as it is from those objects by thousands of years? The only way this can be done is by asserting that no event ever happens at any one particular time, but that every briefest event is an eternal process, identifiable with all actual and possible thoughts of it, past and future. In other words, every event must be exploded to the extremes of time, backward and forward, just as every object had to be exploded to the extremes of space.

Furthermore, the pan-objective view under consideration is forced to deny the privacy and separateness of individual minds, and is faced with a particularly awkward situation in dealing with such psychical entities as emotions, impulses, values, qualities like clearness, and ideas of admittedly non-existent objects. For in these cases there is no object with which to identify the mental content. The denial of its peculiarly mental nature therefore seems doubly difficult. And much the same difficulty reappears when one comes to deal with error, illusion, and hallucination. In spite of many labored attempts to explain away this very patent obstacle, most students of the subject, I think, still fail to see how illusion and error are going to be at all possible if every idea or thought *is* its object.

In this examination of the methods by which contemporary naturalistic epistemology seeks to avoid the necessity of admitting consciousness as something different in kind from physical or purely logical entities, I have not sought to give an actual refutation of the doctrines involved. My aim has been rather to point out the extremes to which the upholders of these views are necessarily driven. If one denies the reality of the subjective, and denies that in knowledge the mind transcends its immediate content, one must maintain all the strange posi-

tions of pan-objectivism which I have been outlining, or others like them.

Why, then, are these paradoxical positions maintained? Why do many of the keenest thinkers of our day insist upon denying the subjective in spite of the difficulties involved in such denial? In answer they will tell us that they have taken this position because of the difficulties they find in the doctrines of those schools which, like Idealism, Critical Realism, and much of the British New Realism, admit the existence of the subjective in some form or other. I do not for a moment doubt the sincerity of this statement. But at the same time I cannot help feeling that the strongest motive at work in the denial of consciousness in the old sense has largely escaped the notice of many of those who make the denial. This motive, I believe, has very little to do with epistemological considerations. It is, in my opinion, the fear that an epistemology which recognizes consciousness as different in kind from matter and not to be identified with its objects, conscious processes as different in kind from physical processes, and knowledge as the activity of a mind which is able to transcend its content — that an epistemology, I say, which takes these or any of these positions is pretty sure to lead in the end to a metaphysics which will prove fatal to the claims of monistic naturalism.

That naturalistic epistemology is justified in admitting this fear, and right in maintaining this opinion, is my own conviction. If the images and processes and mental states by which the mind thinks its objects are not to be identified with those objects but are instead actual entities, actual though not discoverable in all the world of physical space nor parts of the executive order of the physical world, if the activity of knowing is something very different from the "flat piece of substantive experience" to which William James sought to reduce it, if in thinking of the distant in space and the remote in time the mind really transcends its immediate content and becomes, in Plato's phrase, at least potentially, "a beholder of all time and all existence," then it is plain that the mind is something that can hardly be explained by any of the laws of physical nature,

and to which even the most refined formulae of evolutionary naturalism are fundamentally inadequate.

If, then, consciousness or mind, in something like its traditional sense, cannot successfully be explained away by the new epistemology, we must resolutely face the metaphysical question of the relation of the mind to the physical world in which it has its setting. The central and crucial part of this question is, of course, to be found in the mind-body problem. Obviously we cannot here deal with this great question. I wish merely to point out the general nature of the situation. If we refuse to accept the pan-objective epistemology already considered which would do away with consciousness in the subjective and traditional sense, we must recognize that the relation of the mind to the body forms a real and unescapable problem, and unless we are weakly to evade it by an ostrich-like refusal to look it in the face, the alternatives open to us are reduced to two: the acceptance of the doctrine of interaction, on the one hand, or the adoption of one of the naturalistic positions on the other. That interaction has its difficulties it would be impossible to forget, so often have they been pointed out and so emphatically have they been stressed by the advocates of the naturalistic school these many centuries. The classical difficulties most commonly emphasized are two. The first is usually expressed in the oft-heard question: How can two things so different from each other as mind and body interact? To which, it seems to me, the sufficient answer is to be found in the rather obvious query, Why can they not? Are we so sure that unlike things cannot influence each other? The only way really to decide this question is to go to experience and see. And when we do this, we certainly seem very plainly to find in sensation body acting upon mind, and in volition mind acting upon body. The obvious testimony of our everyday normal experience seems to be corroborated by various pathological conditions and by various curative methods. I need hardly mention such things as the age-long use of drugs as stimulants and sedatives, nor the equally ancient and efficacious mental treatment of physical disorders, psycho-analysis and Christian Science, the much talked-of influence of the ductless glands upon personality

and, on the other hand, the unquestionable power of Coué's methods and of auto-suggestion in general upon very real physiological derangements. Surely he who would deny the mutual influence of body and mind upon each other has a heavy burden of proof resting upon his shoulders. And, in fact, the only kind of proof he has to offer for his astounding position is an appeal not *to* experience but *away from* experience; an appeal, namely, to what he regards as the antecedent improbability of any such mutual influence. This so-called antecedent improbability is, in fact, the second of the two difficulties of interaction to which I referred. More specifically it consists in the impossibility of reconciling interaction with the universality of mechanical law. But of course the question whether mechanical law *is* universal is just the question at issue; and it can hardly be called logic to use this affirmed universality both as major premise and as conclusion.

But we can better estimate the importance or negligibility of the difficulties of interaction if we go on to consider the consequences of denying it; or, in other words, the necessary implications of the naturalistic theories of mind and body. Very briefly, then — for we have no time for a detailed consideration of the matter — each of these theories is faced with the dilemma of either denying the efficiency of consciousness or identifying consciousness with matter, motion, or physical energy. One may take one's choice, but choose one must. And the seriousness of either choice must not be overlooked. If we deny all efficiency to consciousness, maintaining that the laws of physical nature determine all the actions of human bodies, we make the evolutionary development of consciousness a hopeless mystery, and we shall be forced to maintain the astounding position that the strategy of Napoleon, the plays of Shakespeare, and the acts of love of all the lovers and all the mothers of the world have in no wise been influenced by thought or feeling. There is no getting around this. It is an identical equation, a tautologous assertion. If the laws of physical nature completely determine all actions and all events, then all actions and all events are determined completely by the laws of physical nature; and though emotions, desires, ideas, plans, purposes,

voluntary acts, may be admitted to exist, they must be denied the least particle of influence upon any of our deeds. No event in the whole history of the race, on this conception, is different from what it would have been had all human beings from *pithecanthropos erectus* to the latest naturalistic philosopher been mere unconscious automata. Even his own writings, such an up-to-date philosopher must assert, are in no wise the product of thought or memory or conscious experience. They were composed, not by his mind, but by his cortex and his typewriter. The naturalistic thinker does not like to dwell upon this aspect of his own theory, but it is an inevitable consequence of his fundamental position, inevitable at least unless he is prepared to choose instead the other horn of the naturalistic dilemma, and affirm that consciousness is to be identified with the physical. If he chooses this course, he may indeed escape the unwelcome necessity of denying efficiency to consciousness; but he does so only at the cost of basing his whole position upon an assertion that is in the last analysis essentially meaningless. I do not say that his assertion is indemonstrable; I do not say that it is improbable. I say that it has no meaning. The sentence, 'Consciousness is physical energy,' is grammatically a perfectly good sentence. It has a subject and a predicate. You can parse it. You can parse it and you can repeat it; but you cannot think it. It is exactly on a par with such a sentence as, 'A logarithm is green cheese.' The tongue runs glibly along each of these sentences, but the thought, starting out bravely enough, simply stops, or turns into the sort of thing our behaviorist friends describe their own thought as being — namely, just the unconscious activity of the language mechanism. We know what we mean by conscious ideas, emotions, intentions, and the rest; and we know what we mean by the physiological processes that go on in the brain; and to assert the absolute identity of the two is to put words together out of which all meaning has evaporated. If such an assertion be not nonsense, there is no such thing as nonsense.

I am making no elaborate attempt to refute the naturalistic position on the mind-body problem. My purpose is simply to draw your attention to the quite unescapable implications of

that position. If one wishes to accept the naturalistic view, of course one may; but one should realize fully all that must be accepted with it. One cannot take it and refuse the implications of which I have been speaking. They go inevitably together. Doubtless interaction has its difficulties, the two most important of which we have considered. As we have seen, these difficulties have little or nothing that is empirical about them. They rest, instead, upon what is called the antecedent improbability of interaction. But, as I have already indicated, and as I think I could clearly show did time permit, this asserted improbability is itself based simply upon an ideal of scientific explanation which we ourselves have constructed and have more or less dogmatically set up. And for the rest, weight the improbability of interaction as heavily as you like, you will have to rouse your emotion of naturalistic enthusiasm to an extraordinary pitch before you can make it compare with the astounding assertion that consciousness never has any influence upon conduct, or with the meaningless assertion that consciousness *is* brain activity.

At an early point in this lecture I spoke of three problems relating to man upon which naturalism, if it is to be thorough and consistent, must take extreme views. Two of these we have now briefly considered — namely, the relation of the mind to its objects and its relation to the body. The third question, as you may remember, had to do with the nature of the self. If we accept the pan-objective epistemology discussed in the early part of this lecture, the self of course either vanishes together with consciousness into the various objects to which the organism responds, or else has to be identified with the physical organism itself. If we accept that form of naturalism which identifies consciousness with the physiological processes of the brain, the self hardens, so to speak, together with its psychic states, into grey and white matter. If, for reasons such as those I have suggested, we find ourselves unable to accept either this view of the mind-body problem or the pan-objective epistemology, but still wish to hold to a naturalistic position, we must, I suppose, in the first place identify the self with the ineffectual mental states which, for some unaccountable reason, accompany

brain-states — the stream of inactive epiphenomena. The self will thus become, in Hume's phrase, "a bundle of sensations and ideas." The untenability of such a position was brought to light long ago by William James. Doubtless there is diversity in the stream of consciousness, but there is unity as well, and the major portion of this unity is the unity of the judging thought, the unity of the active mind. James, to be sure, refused to refer this unity of judgment and action to a self; it belonged rather, he said, to what he called the present judging thought. This present thought was not mere passive content; it was active, and it actively claimed and owned all the memories, all the past states of the conscious stream, as its own. It not only claimed them; it inherited them from its predecessor and passed them on to its successor. It was, in a word, a real, though momentary, self. It had unity, activity — in short all the essential characteristics that are usually attributed to the self, except continuity. Instead of the one continuous self of personalistic philosophy, James gives us a cinematographic succession of momentary selves, flashing into existence and out of it, each cut off from its predecessor and from its successor by the sharp lines of birth and death.

Now there are two obvious comments to be made upon this view. In the first place, introspection shows no such sharp division between successive judging thoughts, no such ever repeated jumping of the moving pictures of our inner life, as James implies. Instead there is continuous progress with no lines of cleavage between successive selves. And the second comment is this: if you recognize this steady continuity of our inner lives, as I think you must, and therefore give up James's notion of a succession of momentary and disparate selves, you have left on your hands, as a result of careful introspection, a modification of James's doctrine which turns out to be in no important respect distinguishable from the view taken by Personalism. The doctrine of the reality of the self does not necessarily maintain the existence of an unknowable something outside of experience and transcending time. It means rather the active unity of experience itself as it goes forward in time, cleaving time as a spear-head steadily cleaves the air, and

identical with its own past in much the same way that anything is identical with its own past. Taken in this sense, the self is both active, unitary, continuous, and real; and it is to this real and discoverable kind of self that, as it seems to me, James's conception is ultimately reducible.

There is only one way, so far as I can see, in which this conclusion can be avoided — at least by those who admit consciousness in the subjective sense at all; and that is by denying the trustworthiness of introspection and challenging James's fundamental assertion that the essence of feeling is to be felt, and that as a psychic existent feels so it must be. This course is therefore adopted by the bolder and more clear-sighted upholders of naturalism. All real activity is thus denied to the mind; processes such as those of attention, meaning, volition, are analyzed into passing and passive sensations and images; and then all these different sorts of passive content are asserted to be composed ultimately of a single homogeneous element. Inasmuch as introspection has been declared fallacious, and the feeling of a feeling has been ruled out of court as giving no evidence concerning the feeling's real nature, almost anything may be true, and the requirements of naturalism are allowed to dictate the conclusion. Thus by a reduction of the multiplicity which introspection discovers to a stark homogeneity we are enabled to reduce quality to quantity. Having done this successfully, we are encouraged to go on and identify this one homogeneous psychical element with some sort of physical element — or the physical with the psychical, it matters little which. In the words of the chief supporter of this view, we must interpret matter in motion as feeling; "but not feeling just as it is introspectively given; feeling, rather, having more spatial divisions and less continuity, and more change of place among the divisions, than we are aware of introspectively; in a word, something truly of the nature of feeling, but in arrangement more like matter in motion."

The conception of a self or personality — a centre of emotion and reason and conscious volition — doubtless has its difficulties, difficulties due chiefly to the fact that if there be a self at all in any meaningful sense it must be *sui generis* and not sus-

ceptible of description in the categories of natural science. But I submit that, paradox for paradox, the inherent improbability of personality as we seem to find it in ourselves is surely not greater than the improbability of a position which abolishes both personality and conscious activity, gives the lie to introspection, reduces the diversity which we actually find to a blank homogeneity, and ends by asserting that feeling is not what we feel but is in arrangement more like matter in motion.

The extreme positions which naturalism is forced to defend, once its logical implications are understood, are such as to make one wonder how they could ever be accepted. But it is not for nothing that naturalism pays the price of these tremendous paradoxes. The naturalistic philosopher realizes that unless he has the courage to accept all these extremes, he must recognize in the world a dualism of process which will make the universal sway of purely naturalistic laws forever impossible. In the recognition of this fact he is unquestionably right. If consciousness be irreducible to the physical, if the laws of mechanism do not fully determine human conduct, if there be such a thing as conscious personality—a real centre of spontaneous activity, then there is a realm of spirit, which has its own laws and whose activities are not to be forecast by the laws of physical science, since they are not determined by these laws. If, now, we define nature as that realm to which natural science applies, we may properly recognize the realm of the spirit as supernatural in a very real and significant sense. And to the acknowledgment of this realm we are driven if we refuse to accept the extreme and seemingly preposterous views of naturalistic monism. Some more or less vague sense of the necessity of choosing between these rival alternatives there has always been; but it is only in our own day that the fact has been brought home to us in sharp, clear outline. No one is more keenly aware of it than the leaders of naturalistic thought. Passage after passage from their writings could be quoted in which they defend their seeming paradoxes explicitly upon the ground that if they be not accepted there is no alternative but what they—quite properly—call supernaturalism. The word supernaturalism is of course sometimes used as synonymous with superstition, but it is not

in this sense that either the naturalists or we are using it. What both of us mean by the word is a dualistic view of reality, a view which finds in the world two kinds of power and of process, a spiritual as well as a physical, a realm of free and conscious activity as well as a realm of passive scientific and unconscious regularity. Which of these views, the dualistic or the monistic, is the true one? Upon the answer to this question depends the answer to the further question, Is religion merely a case of the will to believe, a collection of comforting illusions and deceptive hopes, or is its view of the nature of reality essentially true?

I have tried to point out in this lecture that if we look at the matter in empirical fashion we can hardly deny that the facts of experience and the testimony of consciousness seem plainly to point toward the dualistic view. The argument against this position is based not upon any solid fact but on what is called the inherent and antecedent improbability of dualism. Now when we analyze this improbability, we find that it comes down ultimately to the *improbability of there being in the world any such creature as man*. That is exactly the situation. Let me repeat it. Such a creature as man — a being with a mind that is not a brain, a thought that is not identifiable with its distant object, a will that is capable of affecting the actions of the body, a personality that is not reducible to a succession of sensations — such a creature cannot be made to fit into the naturalistic scheme, and it is for this reason that the naturalistic philosophers deny his existence. They deny his existence because in their opinion such a being is a priori improbable. In their opinion it is most unlikely that there ever could be such a universe — such a queer universe — as this one that we live in.

But after all, we cannot dictate to reality. We cannot reframe its nature to suit our a priori notions of probability. With Margaret Fuller we had best accept the universe. The world we live in is the kind of universe we find it to be — a world that is full of a number of things, and, most surprising of all, a world that has a place in it for that most unlikely of beings, *man*. Man with his spiritual nature is a fact, the fundamental and central fact from which our whole interpretation of the universe may well start. And if we start with man as he is, we shall be

led to recognize that reality stretches out beyond the realm of the merely natural, that it contains a sphere which may well be called the Realm of the Spirit.

This is the conception which religion has always stood for. With unwavering faith it has persistently maintained that the world of matter and force, of mechanical laws and physical evolution is not the whole, and that beings such as we cannot here feel fully and forever at home. The deeply religious souls of all ages and all faiths have with one voice testified that they were "strangers and pilgrims on the earth." Doubtless we belong in part — in large part — to the natural world. We grow out of the soil, perhaps; but we are not wholly of the soil. Our bodies were made of clay; but before we could be fully men God breathed into us the breath of life.

It is, then, to the reality of a supernatural realm, a realm of the spirit, that natural religion and in fact all the religions have in some sense consistently and persistently testified. There are many roads that lead to the conviction that this testimony is true. Only one of them have we had time to follow this evening. But I am convinced that this road, though leading through lowly regions and over no great heights of speculation or inspiration, may safely be trusted to lead us at last to our goal. We know that there is a spiritual realm, because we find that man cannot be adequately understood or described without recognizing the independent reality of the spirit. We know that there is a supernatural realm because we find that we ourselves are in part members of it. We are able to answer religion's question as to reality in the large, because we have seen that man is not merely one of the higher brutes, not merely an outgrowth of the earth, but also a little lower than the angels.

THE ARAMAIC ORIGIN OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

CHARLES C. TORREY

YALE UNIVERSITY

IN the numerous discussions of the Greek of New Testament documents with reference to the question of translation from Aramaic originals, the Fourth Gospel has generally been left out of account. The language of the Synoptists has been examined very diligently from this point of view, especially during the past two or three decades, and at least one competent Semitic scholar has published material of high importance. Wellhausen, in his "*Evangelium Marci*" (1903) and especially in his "*Einleitung in die Drei Ersten Evangelien*" (1905; 2d ed., 1911), argued, perhaps not quite conclusively, for an Aramaic original of our Gospel of Mark; and he and many others have discussed, in a somewhat desultory fashion, the question of possible written Semitic sources for portions of Matthew and Luke. To the majority of New Testament scholars it probably would seem superfluous, to many perhaps even ridiculous, to raise similar queries in regard to John, whether it be proposed to regard it as a formal translation, from beginning to end, or as "based on Semitic sources" — whatever this vague and unprofitable formula may mean. Since the time when the origin and authorship of the book first began to be discussed, its essentially Hellenistic character has rarely been questioned. It is generally taken for granted at the present day, even by those scholars who are most inclined to look for "translation Greek" in the New Testament. The reasons for this are obvious, and good as far as they go.

In the first place, the Gospel of John is connected by early tradition with Ephesus. If, as the great majority of Christian scholars since the third century have believed, it was first put forth in that city, the strong presumption is that it was originally composed in Greek. Again, the philosophy and theology of the book, so far removed from anything in the Synoptists,

have seemed, at least to Christian scholars, to be strange to Palestine and to breathe the atmosphere of the Hellenistic schools. The metaphysical prologue, the prevailingly allegorical method, the mystical quality of the writer's thought, the remarkable dogmatic development, these and other seeming indications of a foreign land and a comparatively late date have made their strong impression. Finally, the language itself has afforded a fair basis of argument. It is decidedly less awkward than the typical renderings of Semitic originals. The style, so remarkably simple and clear, disarms suspicion; and the diction is generally free from barbarisms, so that it is difficult to convict the writer of clear offences against current Greek usage. Quotations from the Old Testament are few in number as compared with those in the Synoptists, whence it happens that the reader is neither constantly reminded of the language of the LXX, nor made aware of a direct use of the Hebrew scriptures.

The case for a Greek original of the Fourth Gospel might thus appear to be sufficiently strong. Evidence to the contrary, however, has been accumulating in recent years, and some arguments which at first appeared convincing have been seen to lose their force.

The tradition regarding Ephesus is not only distressingly ambiguous, as every critical investigator knows, but also rests on a foundation which is, to say the least, insecure. The primary reason why the gospel was held to be Ephesian, and therefore was especially cherished and celebrated in Ephesus and the adjoining parts of Asia from a very early date, was undoubtedly the belief that the Apostle John, plainly indicated as its author, spent his last years in this region; a belief deeply rooted and widespread, first appearing to our view in the Book of Revelation. Added to this belief, moreover, and more or less complicated with it, is the seemingly authentic record of a John, "the presbyter," a "disciple of the Lord," who was living in Asia in the latter part of the first century, according to the testimony of Polycarp and Papias. It does not appear that this John of Asia was ever thought of in the early period as connected with the tradition of the Fourth Gospel, except in so

far as he was confounded with the apostle. In our own day, however, it has become increasingly common to conjecture for him some connection with it.

What, now, is the verdict of the foremost New Testament scholars of the present day as to the sojourn of the Apostle John in Asia? Few questions have been studied with such eagerness and critical acumen as this. A condensed but clear summary of the available material is given in Walter Bauer's "Johannesevangelium" (1912), pp. 3 f. (in Lietzmann's "Handbuch zum Neuen Testament"), and an unqualified negative is given as the answer. Professor Bacon, who probably has examined the evidence as thoroughly and carefully as any other scholar, reaches the following conclusion in his "Fourth Gospel in Research and Debate," 2d ed., 1918, pp. 153 f.: "As regards the person and work specifically there is nothing whatever to suggest his presence in Asia save the acceptance of Revelation by Papias and Justin. . . . The later Irenaeian tradition of apostles and elders in Asia can only be a pseudo-tradition, whose origin must be studied in connection with the dissemination of the fourfold gospel." And again, p. 267: "We have ourselves seen reason for the decided conviction that Irenaeus' whole notion of an apostolic group about John in Asia rests on nothing more than the older assertions of his sojourn in Patmos, Polycarp's references to intercourse in boyhood with 'John' and others who had seen the Lord, and his own misinterpretation of Papias." With these conclusions there would doubtless now be widespread agreement among the ablest investigators of the problem.

But even if the belief in the sojourn of John the son of Zebedee in Asia is thus discredited, the student of the Ephesian tradition is only at the beginning of his inquiry, whether as to Asia as in some true sense the place of origin of the gospel or as to a "Johannine" authorship. It is necessary to take into account the three *epistles* of John, which evidently stand in some close literary relation to the gospel, and whose author styles himself *ὁ πρεσβύτερος*. Chapter 21 appears to be a later augmentation of the gospel; the addition may have been made in the locality where the work was first composed, or in some

other district or country. Does the 'we' of 21, 24 refer to the Christian community at Ephesus? If the question of a Semitic original is raised, new complications arise. Was the appended chapter also Semitic? Was the Greek translation of the whole made in the province of Asia? Is any "Semitic flavor" apparent in the Johannine epistles? May their "presbyter" author be identified with the aged disciple known to Polycarp? What relation, if any, does the Apocalypse bear to the epistles and the gospel? These are all matters of the utmost obscurity, complicated to a degree which only the experts in New Testament science and the history of the first Christian centuries can adequately understand. There is no present prospect of reducing the main questions to any simple formula. A very bold man might pronounce confidently on the who and where and when of these various literary activities, and a very sanguine young scholar might expect also to convince his colleagues. One fact, however, important for the present investigation, results from the very complexity of the problems of authorship and locality. Whatever verity there may be behind the hypothesis connecting a John of Asia with the promulgation of the Fourth Gospel, there is plenty of room left for an inquiry as to the original language of the book in its primitive form. As far as any claims of tradition are concerned, the question is open.

Aside from the fact that the tradition regarding Ephesus is precarious, and at best ambiguous, it has been observed by many scholars that the internal evidence of the gospel itself favors Palestine, rather than any country of the Dispersion, as the scene of its origin. There are, indeed, very striking indications that the author of this account of the public career and teachings of Jesus was intimately acquainted with the localities, both of major and minor importance, with which his narrative is concerned. The main facts were well stated by Sanday in his "Authorship and Historical Character of the Fourth Gospel" (1872), pp. 288 f., and repeated by him in Lecture IV of his "Criticism of the Fourth Gospel" (1905). The significance of this evidence is generally admitted even by those who are least inclined to give the gospel an early date, or to regard

it as Palestinian in its origin; see for example Schmiedel in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, article 'Gospels,' col. 1796. Wellhausen, "*Evangelium Johannis*" (1908), p. 125, got from the many Johannine names and descriptions of localities not otherwise known the impression of a parading of "antiquarian rarities" — such, of course, they were for him. The author of the gospel seems to him to make one fatal slip, however: "Ein völliger Mangel an wirklicher topographischer Anschauung des heiligen Landes zeigt sich darin, dass die Leute von dem quellenreichen Sichem (Sychar) nach einer Zisterne gehen müssen, um Wasser zu holen." Admitting that "Sychar" is Shechem, this criticism reads into the narrative what is neither contained nor implied in it. Wellhausen admits that the claim, so often made, that the evangelist shows himself imperfectly acquainted with Jewish customs and hierocratic regulations is unfounded, and gives examples proving the contrary. Bacon (pp. 385 ff.) discusses at some length "the fourth evangelist's topography, which not only differs in a very striking way from the Synoptic, but admittedly indicates a first-hand knowledge of certain Palestinian localities"; also "his chronology, which is equally peculiar, and which also, in our judgment, indicates use of independent Palestinian tradition." To account for the first-hand acquaintance with the topography Bacon adopts the interesting theory (reminding of Wellhausen's estimate) that the author of the work was a second-century pilgrim to the Holy Land, visiting the numerous sacred sites. Of course the natural explanation of the writer's intimate knowledge of the land, and his preference for the local chronology, if no other considerations prohibited, would be that he himself was a Palestinian. The question whether this hypothesis is tenable may be left aside for the present. At all events, the claim of Ephesus to be the primitive home of the gospel seems more and more doubtful as the evidence is examined.

It is from the teaching of the book, however, that the chief argument for its origin in Greek surroundings has always been derived. The evidence here is striking and pervasive; to very many scholars it has seemed conclusive even without other confirmation, and only a very superficial inquirer could deal

with it as a matter of minor importance. Nevertheless, the 'must be' is rather apparent than real; the argument is, after all, based on extremely scanty and one-sided evidence, and it cannot be denied that the investigations of recent years have tended more and more to reduce its force. Are not the philosophy and theology of the book Hellenistic? Doubtless, if "Hellenistic" means influenced by Greek thought. This fact, however, can carry with it no conclusion as to the locality in which the author lived and wrote, or as to the language in which he composed his work. Had not Palestine itself been a "Hellenistic" land for many generations? One of the chief causes of the popular unrest, and the exasperation of the orthodox religious leaders, which culminated in the Maccabean uprising, more than two centuries before the earliest date to which the Gospel of John could possibly be assigned, was the encroachment of foreign modes of life and thought. It was not only by the common people and the uncultivated that the "new light" was seen. The reproach of *ἀνομία* touched the advanced thinkers as well as the neglecters of the sabbath and the frequenters of the gymnasium; it was the danger of foreign doctrines, even more than that of foreign customs, that was apprehended. And the new thought inevitably found its way in, and was welcomed and assimilated — unquestionably to the improvement, rather than the detriment, of Jewish theology. Since the third century B.C. there had been an increasing gain from this source, as we have evidence aside from mere probability. It is as easy to keep out the sunlight from a windowed house as to prevent the atmosphere of a new philosophy from reaching the scholars of a people whose doors are open. We find it convenient to fence off Palestine from the rest of the Hellenistic world, when we are speaking of its (conjectured) philosophy of the Greek period, as though it had lived its own untouched life. There was in fact no such isolation. Jerusalem was a cosmopolitan city, in some true sense. Streams of pilgrims and sojourners, from every quarter of the known world, flowed into and through it. Opinions as well as commodities were exchanged. Also throughout the land there was constant intercourse of Jew with gentile, and some intellectual barter, for it was a time of

unrest and inquiry. The Jews were leaders in theology in that day as before, and they have always been a people of alert mind, quick to comprehend and adapt. They had no monopoly of religious truth, and received something in return for what they gave.

One of the most unfortunate and misleading features of the prevailing modern interpretation of the Judaism of "the Land" in the last centuries B.C. is the assumption (very natural, but thoroughly mistaken) that the minute fragment of Hebrew-Aramaic literature which happens to have been preserved for us represents fairly the Palestinian Jewish thought of its day. The fact is that we know extremely little about the intellectual life of Israel in the Graeco-Roman period, in any part of the world, and next to nothing about the thought and language of the Palestinian Jewish philosophers, of whom there must have been many. Good fortune has rescued for us the principal works of a Jew of Egypt, Philo, doubtless a typical example of the long-standing attempt to make use of Greek philosophy in interpreting the history and faith of Israel as the chosen of the peoples of the earth. The so-called Fourth Book of Maccabees, which (though it originally circulated among Jews) owes its preservation solely to Christian interest, is another example, of a very different type. There is nothing fantastic or improbable in the conjecture that if some miracle could have saved for us the literature circulating in Palestine at the dawn of the present era, we should find in it many able treatises, of various degrees of originality, embodying aspects of Hellenistic speculation which were commonplaces in all the learned centres. The mentally alert among the highly educated, in such cities as Jerusalem, Damascus, Caesarea, Samaria, and the chief cities of Galilee, could not be ignorant of the principal movements of thought in the Mediterranean world. The connection with Egypt was always especially close. There must have been in some of these lesser centres Jewish scholars, advanced thinkers, who reached out eagerly for the new metaphysical ideas and embodied them in their own speculative treatises, composed occasionally, no doubt, in Greek, but far oftener in Aramaic, which was not only the vernacular, but had

been for many centuries the chief literary language of Western Asia. Translation was almost as familiar a proceeding as writing itself, and had been so, from time immemorial, in all these regions. The current philosophical terminology was easily rendered, and Aramaic, in some ways the most elastic and adaptable of all the Semitic languages, was the same very respectable medium of interpretation then as in later years in the hands of the multitude of scholars who translated Greek treatises into "Syriac." A foreign work which seemed likely to be interesting to many — for the Jews of that time were a book-making and book-reading people (Eccles. 11, 12) — could be made available in this way. How long a time would elapse before a literary masterpiece, circulating in Egypt, could find its way to Azotus, or Sidon, or Capernaum? Perhaps a decade, perhaps a few months. Communication was easy, at all events, and the student who really wished to learn could be satisfied. "Judas (Maccabaeus) rescued from the war and collected for us certain books, and we have them here," wrote the Jews of Jerusalem to their brethren in Egypt, in the second century B.C. (the original language of the letter probably Aramaic); "if you have need of them, send and get them" (2 Macc. 2, 14 f.). Guessing at a lost literature is useful to only a very limited extent, to be sure, but it is likely that close students of this period of Jewish affairs will agree in holding it as virtually certain that there existed in Palestine at the close of the last century B.C. a written body of new doctrine with a Greek tinge; and I think that the probability will be admitted, by those best capable of judging, that the principal language in which it was embodied was Aramaic. Whatever such writings existed, perished along with the great bulk of the Palestinian Jewish literature. Why should they have been preserved? Just in proportion as they were definitely "Hellenistic" would they have been left to their fate. The zealous patriots, in their desperate extremity of persecution by Greeks and Romans, could not possibly rescue more than a handful of their writings. Their effort was not directed to keeping what was representative as literature, or intellectually eminent, but only to saving what was sacred, the ancient documents (actually such or so

reputed) which had significance for their religious history, from the patriarchs to the restoration in the Persian period. Even such out-and-out Hebrew monuments of the old Jewish spirit as the Wisdom of Ben Sira and the deeply religious history known to us as First Maccabees were abandoned, to say nothing of the hundreds of writings, influential in their own day, of which no trace has survived.

Some decades ago it was customary to speak of the metaphysical prologue of the Fourth Gospel as "Alexandrine philosophy," with the implication that it could not have been composed in Palestine. In recent years there has been increasing recognition of the fact that the foreign-born terms and ideas, going beyond anything contained in the Hebrew scriptures on the one hand or in the Synoptic gospels on the other, were in general the typical product of their time rather than the property of any particular school or locality. The Jew of Graeco-Roman Palestine who had a mind for theological speculation would be certain to find guidance into these fruitful fields as soon as he talked with scholars. This, apparently, is the way in which the author of the Fourth Gospel obtained his bit of Greek philosophy. The distinctly "Hellenistic" element contained in his extraordinary work makes the impression of being the adopted means of answering certain profound questions rather than the outcropping of a characteristic mode of thought. It would not be dealing justly with it to speak of it as applied externally, for the evangelist has thought deeply and found firm standing-ground, as is shown by the essential harmony of his theology throughout the book; but the terms in which he ordinarily thinks — with all the depth of his thought — are characterized by Semitic simplicity, not by Greek subtlety. Certainly not all those who approach the study of the book from the point of view given by the early Christian writings, profane Greek literature, and the *κοινὴ* of the papyri, realize to what an extent this is true. First and last, in spite of the few plain traces of foreign speculation, the writing is Palestinian.

Interesting evidence in this direction is afforded by Schlatter's "Sprache und Heimat des vierten Evangelisten" (Gütersloh, 1902), a monograph which attempts to show that the lan-

guage of this gospel is essentially that of the contemporary native writers using their own Semitic idioms. It is true that "contemporary" writings, strictly speaking, are not to be had, for all the Jewish literature of the first century has perished, with the exception of those bits (chiefly documents of the New Testament) which have survived in Christian renderings into Greek. Even Jewish writings of the second century, composed in the language of the land and extensive enough to be used for purposes of comparison, are wanting. The first considerable monuments of Palestinian literature emerging after the great catastrophe and surviving to the present day are the Mishna (exposition of the Traditional Law), the Targums, and the older Midrashim. The Targums, though Aramaic, are translations (the oldest of them generally rendering the Hebrew quite closely), and therefore are of limited value to one looking for the vernacular speech. It is to the Midrashim that Schlatter turns, taking his illustrative material from Mechilta and Sifre — expositions of Exodus and Numbers-Deuteronomy respectively — with occasional recourse to other Rabbinic commentaries of approximately the same date. These all, like the Mishna, represent no actually living speech, but are composed in the "new Hebrew" which was the language of the Rabbinic schools. In both substance and form, however, they give us, for the most part, what is well attested as current in the second century of our era. As Schlatter remarks, and illustrates by numerous examples, the idioms of Hebrew and Aramaic are so nearly alike that whatever is said in the one language could also be said, in nearly or quite the same form, in the other. He presents parallels, chapter by chapter and verse by verse (or rather, phrase by phrase), throughout the Gospel and the First Epistle of John. The parallels which he brings are not always impressive in themselves; some of them seem to me nearly or quite worthless; and a superficial or hasty reading will be likely to miss their significance. The comparison touches the mere form of expression, the vocabulary, the phrase, oftener than the underlying thought. The reader who expects to find here a foreshadowing of the Johannine theology will go away disappointed; the originality of the evangelist is un-

touched. It is to be noted that every part of the gospel is drawn upon. In the first chapter, phrases are taken from 34 of the 51 verses; in the prologue (1, 1-18), 14 verses are laid under contribution. In the discourses of chaps. 13-17, where in the nature of the case comparison is not easy, 49 verses furnish illustrative material. His conclusion is (pp. 8 ff., 178 ff.) that the native speech of the author was Aramaic, and that he wrote his gospel in a sort of Greek which was essentially a mere rendering of his own Semitic idioms into the imperfectly mastered foreign tongue. As he says (p. 178), let the doubter attempt to furnish some genuinely Greek text, a document which is *not* Palestinian, nor Semitic, in its origin — one of the biographies of Plutarch, or a treatise of Philo, or one of the letters in the *κοινὴ* of the papyri — with a similar running commentary derived from these Midrashim, and he will be made to see the impossibility of reaching a similar result. In spite of the obvious defects in this display of parallels, and in spite of the strong objection which may be made to certain of his inferences, Schlatter's demonstration is valid for its main contention. The verbal embodiment of the evangelist's thought, sentence by sentence, from the first chapter to the last, is essentially Semitic, only superficially and apparently Greek.

A comparison of another kind, going deeper than Schlatter's and including the Old Testament as well as the Rabbinic writings, would show that the whole substructure of the Johannine theology is Jewish. No spokesman of the nascent Christian doctrine stands more squarely and firmly than "John" on the basis of the Hebrew faith. There is no need to insist upon this, for it is well known. The teaching of the fourth evangelist, like that of the other Christian writers of the first century, has for its chief source the Hebrew Messianic doctrine in its purest form; the ancient doctrine, but re-stated from the new point of view reached through the contemplation of the life and death of Jesus. Our evangelist's great contribution was his intimate mystical interpretation of the person of the Messiah and of the revelation given through him, an interpretation such as no other gave or — we may say with confidence — could have given.

Among the characteristic features of the Johannine teaching which have caused many scholars to turn their search-lights away from Palestine toward Ephesus, Antioch, or Alexandria, and to resist any suggestion of a Semitic original of this document, are the wide outlook of the writer, especially as regards the Christian church; the way in which he seems to stand apart from, if not at a distance from, "the Jews"; and the striking advance which his Christian doctrine shows over what is to be found in the Synoptists. No one of these considerations, however, need take us beyond Judea and Galilee, nor to a later date than the third quarter of the first century. The evangelist's outlook, at its widest, goes not a whit beyond that of the true Messianic hope, as set forth in detail by the Second Isaiah. What the Hebrew prophet foresaw and predicted was the redemption of God's elect, from every nation and people, led by a purified Israel in the coming age, after the incorrigible foes of the One God, Israelites and Gentiles alike, had been swept away by the Messiah and his hosts. This and nothing else was the essential program of the primitive Nazarenes, with the difference, that the Anointed One had already come, and that therefore there was such an immediate and pressing necessity of *sending the message abroad* as had never existed before. This necessity was evident as soon as Jesus was recognized as the Messiah. It is the mainspring of the Gospel of Mark, which is merely a compendium put together for immediate missionary use; it is no less apparent in the more elaborate gospels of Matthew and Luke. To whom was the message to be sent? Primarily, of course, to the Jews, who must first be gathered in, forming the vast nucleus from which the leaven would then go forth into every other people. So the Second Isaiah conceived the process; so every patriotic Israelite must have wished to see it; so, in all probability, the author of the Fourth Gospel hoped for its accomplishment. "Salvation is from the Jews" (4, 22), but is to extend to "the world" (vs. 42). Paul, on the contrary, after his first bitter experience, was ready to turn directly and primarily to the Gentiles. John, like his fellow evangelists, had constantly in mind "the ends of the earth" — the phrase so often used by the Second Isaiah. Hence, plainly,

many incidental features of the narrative, which would have been differently conceived, or omitted altogether, if the writer had had merely Palestinian readers, or even Jews only, in mind. The question of the original language is not affected by this consideration; Aramaic was understood, to some extent, wherever there were Jewish colonies (that is, all over the known world), and there would never be lack of an interpreter where one was necessary. Whoever had the message to give could write in his own language. The Prophets had written in Hebrew, and the translators were ready when they were needed.

Regarding the way in which the evangelist speaks of *οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι*, Bauer (on 1, 19), expresses a view which is widely held, when he says: "Joh. spricht von den Juden fort und fort in einer Weise, die sich nur erklärt unter der Voraussetzung, dass die Juden als Nation zu bestehen aufgehört haben." This is indeed an easy — almost too easy — explanation of the evangelist's habit, but there are other modes of interpretation which lie quite as near and are much more probable. In itself, the term, as used by one Jew in speaking of his fellows, is in no way remarkable; the examples are abundant. Nor is the tone of reproach, or antagonism, in which it is sometimes employed, a thing to occasion surprise. From whom did the bitter and relentless antagonism come, from the time when the claims of Jesus to be the Messiah were first urged by his followers, through the struggles of the apostles in founding their church after his death, as recounted in the Book of Acts and the Epistles of Paul? Who barred the way to the realization of the splendid plan for the redemption of the wide world, Gentile and Jewish alike? In point of fact, the Christian church found in orthodox Judaism a consistent and permanent opponent, for very obvious reasons. A man of insight who was well acquainted with the official circles in Jerusalem especially might have foreseen this outcome long before the middle of the first century. The condemned and executed agitator, sligher of the Mosaic law, the son of a Galilean carpenter, was *not* the king and deliverer, the scion of the house of David, whom the prophets had seemed to describe and the teachers for generations past had pictured. Such a collection of proof-texts as

that in the Gospel of Matthew would arouse only ridicule; it could not be accepted as valid evidence by those who were inclined to question it. In any quarter of the world where the "Nazarenes" were brought into contact with the prevailing type of Judaism, so firmly constituted and sharply defined, the opposition would become apparent, but at no time and in no place was its irreconcilable nature so evident, the shell of this solid national and doctrinal system so certainly impenetrable by what the Christians sought to introduce, as in Palestine before 70 A.D. John merely expresses the same contrast which Paul felt when he wrote: "Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one." Are we to believe that Paul thought of these persecutors of his as merely "eine historische Grösse"? The earliest documents of the New Testament frequently speak of the opponents of Jesus and his disciples as "the people," or "the multitude," meaning the *Jewish* people. John is more exact; it was not simply literary preference that determined his usage. Of his loyalty to his people I have already spoken; it is as unswerving as that of Paul; but it is the loyalty of the Old Testament prophets, who, though really holding the doctrine of "the chosen people" more firmly and consistently than their complacent contemporaries, yet in their moods of hot indignation seem to predict the destruction of the whole unworthy race. Thus the Second Isaiah, in a characteristic outburst, addresses the whole house of Jacob as the people who call themselves by the name of Israel, and claim the holy city and the support of the God of Israel, "*not in truth nor by right!*" (48, 1). So John represents Jesus as saying to his obdurate hearers that they are no true sons of Abraham (8, 39). So also in Matt. 3, 9 and Luke 3, 8 John the Baptist warns that God can raise up from the stones of the field better "children of Abraham" than the unfaithful Israelites.

Those who have looked for indications of time and place in the theology of the Fourth Gospel are a widely disagreeing multitude. The theory that the book represents Philonic philosophy (though lacking all the principal features of that school of thought) is no longer in the foreground, its adherents are a dwindling minority. The attempt to show the origin of

the Johannine ideas in Montanism convinced very few. Wellhausen is perhaps too sanguine when he says (p. 124) that the long-familiar theories of Gnostic influence and of a polemic against Gnosticism have been generally abandoned, but he is certainly right in maintaining that there is here nothing definitely characteristic of this school of thought. Not a few scholars discover "Paulinism" in the book, while others, equally well acquainted with Paul's writings, scout the idea. Some cry one thing and some another; while the one certainty that emerges, as to the teaching of the evangelist, is that he was a mystic with a peculiarly individual, highly original point of view. It is misleading to speak of the "dogmatic development" in John in such a way as to imply that it marks a necessarily *later stage* than that represented by the Synoptists. What we see is the profound experience of a man, not by any means that of a church; it is the advance made possible by a great soul, not by a series of years. In a writing whose keynote is practical religion rather than speculation or intellectual argument, and whose author takes his material from his own inner store rather than from the writings of others, it is not surprising that a definite location in place and time should be difficult. Wellhausen, after deciding in general that the various prevalent conjectures as to the home of the author are without any good foundation, concludes by saying (p. 126): "Auch der gewaltige inhaltliche Unterschied des vierten Evangeliums von den drei ersten macht es unwahrscheinlich, dass es auf demselben Boden wie jene entstanden sei; es würde dann kaum die alte jerusalemische Tradition mit solcher Freiheit behandeln." This dictum, however, puts a singularly artificial limit to the activity of the human mind. Was Palestine so unlike every other quarter of the educated world that it could produce no original ideas, even under the stimulus of great events? Did not Jesus himself, a Palestinian, treat the old Jerusalem tradition with considerable "freedom"?

We are brought, then, at last to the very important question of the original language of the book. *Is its Greek a translation?* As has already been said above, it has by no means the same *degree* of Semitic coloring that is apparent in the three Synoptic

gospels. This fact may, of course, mean simply that it is the work of a translator who conceived his task in a way somewhat approaching that in which any modern translator would conceive it, preferring to use Greek idioms and feeling himself under no obligation to retain the characteristically Semitic *forms* of expression where nothing was to be gained by it. There is certainly need of an investigation going deeper than that which was undertaken by Schlatter. How, and by whom, is the inquiry to be made that will do justice to whatever Semitic element there may be in the gospel, with a fair prospect of gaining whatever assured result the evidence can afford? The late J. H. Moulton, in his admirable "Grammar of New Testament Greek," Vol. II, p. 19, says, in speaking of Luke's gospel: "Neither Aramaic specialists nor Hellenistic have the right to decide whether he had any knowledge of a Semitic tongue: what we really need is prolonged collaboration of both, till a joint impression is formed which may have elements of authoritativeness." I agree heartily as to the "collaboration," but feel that it has hitherto been hopelessly one-sided, with the result that no firm standing-ground has been attained. The fact that the study has been "prolonged" in this way is the reason why the Synoptic problem is still unsolved, and why it is still possible for scholars to believe that the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke were composed in Greek. Every linguistic feature in the Greek of the New Testament can be "explained" from the Hellenistic side; it is only necessary to read the commentaries in order to be assured of this. But only Semitic specialists, and in particular those who have made a long study of translation Greek from the Semitic side, can judge as to the extent and meaning of the Semitisms which are encountered. As Schlatter remarks (p. 9, note 2), the decisions, at this point, of those who are only specialists in Greek decide nothing.

The Gospel of John has indeed received some attention from Semitic scholars, but no one until Burney (see below) has given thorough treatment to any portion of the Semitic evidence. Dalman, who is perhaps more thoroughly equipped as regards knowledge of Aramaic than any other investigator, has simply

taken for granted the originally Hellenistic character of the gospel, and therefore has very little to offer for our present purpose. His remarks on the language of John in his "Worte Jesu" are generally designed to show how this gospel is less Semitic than the Synoptic gospels — themselves, in his opinion, originally Greek. Wellhausen, whose treatment even of the language of Mark is inadequate, plainly brings to his reading of the Fourth Gospel firmly fixed ideas as to its character and history which have affected both his observation and his interpretation of details. No one need object, indeed, to his general statement, p. 126, in regard to the undoubted Aramaic element in John, that the evangelist's Greek phraseology is "nicht entfernt so gefärbt wie die des Markus und des Verfassers der dem Matthäus und Lukas gemeinsamen Redestücke"; I said the same thing in my 'Translations made from the Original Aramaic Gospels,' in "Studies in the History of Religions presented to Crawford Howell Toy," 1912, p. 272. His final conclusion is (p. 145) that the author's knowledge of Aramaic had no effect on his Greek; though his language resembles that of Mark inasmuch as it is the vulgar dialect, it differs from it in that is not a disguised Aramaic. I think it can be shown that in this judgment Wellhausen is mistaken. In his brief and too hasty characterization of the Johannine Greek (pp. 133-145) he notes numerous Semitisms, some of which are declared to be "merkwürdig," but they are all dismissed lightly, as being much fewer in number than those in the Synoptists and therefore (!) of no significance; as though he had forgotten that the important evidence is to be sought in the stray solecism rather than in the ninety and nine classical idioms which need no justification. We know already that the evangelist is trying to write Greek, as well as his handicap — whatever it is — will let him. The only hope of learning the nature of his handicap lies in studying the occasional failures, lapses, or deliberate transgressions. Reckoning the proportion of correct usage tells nothing whatever as to the writer's relative knowledge of Greek, if he and the others with whom he is compared happen to be translating; it shows merely the habit or immediate aim of the individual translator. Wellhausen points out numerous

Semitisms, see pp. 133 (two), 134 (two), 138 (three), 141, 142, 143, but does not account for their presence in the gospel. Still oftener he notes peculiar Johannine usages without any suggestion as to their origin, although they correspond to regular and characteristic Semitic idioms; see (*ibid.*) §§ 3 note 3, 6, 7 end, 8, 9 (Aramaism), 10 note, 11 end (Aramaism), 12 beginning and end (Aramaisms), 13 (Aramaism), 14, 15, 17 middle, 20 (infin. absol., idiomatic in Aramaic as well as in Hebrew), 21 third paragraph, 23 second paragraph. Among the peculiarities of usage which he designates as especially characteristic of the Fourth Gospel are the following: (1) The use of a correlative, usually a pronoun, sometimes an adverbial expression, referring back to a relative, participle, or substantive (§ 6). This is a very common and characteristic Semitic usage. (2) A frequent use of *ἐπί*, for which *ὑπέρ* is sometimes exchanged (§ 7 end, § 21 paragraph 3). This is simply the translation of the Aramaic *by*, the idiomatic use of which corresponds in every case. (3) A peculiar way of using the separate pronouns of the first and second persons in the nominative case redundantly, as subject of a finite verb where no emphasis is intended (§ 18). This, Wellhausen fails to see, is due to the wide use of the Aramaic present participle (which use explains also the Johannine Greek discussed in § 12). With this participle the pronouns of the first and second persons are regularly employed. This is one of the most striking and certain Aramaisms in John.

By cutting out a considerable portion of the gospel as secondary, and emending the text of 2, 3 (§ 14), Wellhausen eliminates the genitive absolute from the "Grundschrift." It occurs frequently, however (Burney enumerates 17 cases), and is employed in precisely the manner of the LXX. The claim (§ 19) that in John μέσος is an adjective, not a noun "as in Semitic," is refuted by 20, 19; 26, εἰς τὸ μέσον. It is a strange assertion (p. 133 bottom), that "the genuine Semitic way (die echt semitische Art)" of reinforcing a *casus pendens* by a pronoun is not characteristic of John's language ("findet sich bei J. höchstens annähernd in besonderen Fällen"). Burney cites 27 examples, and the construction is used in *precisely* the "genuine Semitic way." Wellhausen does record the significant fact

(§ 1) that in the sentence the verb generally precedes, while the subject comes later. He proposes to explain this (p. 134) as “imitation of the Biblical style”; an explanation which, in view of the general character of John’s Greek, has in my opinion not the least plausibility. A very characteristic Semitic construction is the clause in which a relative pronoun is followed by a pronominal or adverbial complement. Instead of saying, ‘the place in which the children of Israel dwelt,’ the Semitic would say, ‘the place which the children of Israel dwelt in it.’ This idiom, though possible in Greek (Moulton, I, pp. 94 f.), would hardly be chosen by cultivated authors, such as our New Testament writers; would never be imitated, unless by deliberate and uncommonly skilful forgers; but is quite easily taken over by a translator. Wellhausen, § 3, asserts that there is “no trace” of this construction to be found in John. There is however a perfect example in 1, 27, οὗ . . . αὐτοῦ, and another, equally good, in 13, 26, ὧ . . . αὐτῶ. Wellhausen, indeed, notices 1, 33, ἐφ’ ὃν . . . ἐπ’ αὐτόν, but tries (without success, it seems to me) to explain it otherwise. Another Semitic usage of which he finds “keine Spur” (§ 1, cf. § 17) is the construct state. This barbarism is indeed easily avoided, and John’s use of the Greek article is ordinarily idiomatic; nevertheless there are distinct “traces” of the Semitism. In 1, 49, if John had not been rendering the construct, he would certainly have written ὁ βασιλεὺς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ (the phrase immediately preceding was *not* construct); nor in 5, 29 would he have written εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς and εἰς ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως. In 5, 27, the Curetonian and Peshitta versions are quite correct in rendering ‘the Son of Man’; it was as *the* בן אדם of Dan. 7, 13 that the judgment was given into his hands, not as a participant in human nature; cf. vs. 22. In 4, 5, what the author intended was certainly ‘Jacob’s well,’ not ‘a well of Jacob.’ The πηγή τοῦ Ἰακώβ is precisely the same too literal rendering with which we are so familiar in the Greek translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. Thus, for example, Josh. 15, 9, ἐπὶ πηγὴν ὕδατος Ναφθώ, ‘to *the* spring of *the* water of N.’; 1 Sam. 6, 14, εἰς ἀγρὸν Ἰησοῦ, ‘to *the* field of Joshua’; Neh. 3, 16, ἕως κήπου τάφου Δαυείδ, ‘to *the* garden of *the* tomb of David’; and hundreds of

similar cases. Another instance in John is 6, 68, *ῥήματα ζωῆς αἰωνίου*, 'the words of eternal life.' Every earnest and faithful Jewish teacher (and there certainly were many such) had 'words' of eternal life; one only had *the* words. Still another example is 9, 5, *φῶς εἰμὶ τοῦ κόσμου*, 'I am *the* light of the world.' Contrast 1, 4; 8, 12; Matt. 5, 13 f.; where the translation is not so literal; and compare Ps. 26 (27), 1, *Κύριος ὑπερασπιστὴς τῆς ζωῆς μου*, 'the Lord is *the* protector of my life'; 27 (28), 8, *Κύριος κραταίωμα τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*, 'the Lord is *the* strength of his people,' and the multitude of similar passages in which the rendering is too literal to be correct as Greek.

Moulton, II, pp. 32 f. sets great store, very naturally, by Wellhausen's verdict. He takes note, indeed, of the seemingly strong argument for a Semitic original derived from the fact that the verb generally precedes the subject, but thinks to offset this by quoting Wellhausen's (very misleading) dictum that the order of words in John is generally unsemitic — as though by emphasizing the number of sound links in a chain the presence of broken links could be rendered insignificant. He also cites that scholar's (mistaken) assertion regarding the construct state, and remarks with approval that he "stays his hand" when he finds an "occasional" *casus pendens* (see above) followed by a resumptive pronoun. (If Wellhausen had been less inclined to stay his hand, and had made a really thorough investigation, he would have given us a more valuable essay.) Moulton concludes: "The linguistic evidence all goes to show that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a man who, while cultured to the last degree, wrote Greek after the fashion of men of quite elementary attainment." I confess that my credulity is insufficient for this. Where and when can be found a literary proceeding in any true sense parallel to the one here imagined by Moulton? I am aware that Matthew, Mark, Luke, the first half of Acts, and the Book of Revelation are all supposed to afford illustration of it, but another explanation seems to me incomparably more probable. These writers of Greek were all highly educated men, with a wide knowledge of the Greek tongue — and yet, somehow, with very little knowledge of it, according to the current theory! Before they are convicted of

the willingness to write an uncouth, *learned* patois, the possibility (which is also the antecedent probability) that they are merely translating ought to be investigated more thoroughly than hitherto. Why should a "cultured" man presume to do the thing which Moulton imagines John to have done? Writing for readers whose native tongue was Aramaic, he would of course have written in Aramaic. Writing for Greek readers, he surely would have known better than to repel them by employing the speech of a half-educated man. If among his cultured acquaintances there were any who knew how to write idiomatic Greek, they could easily have revised his manuscript, or written at his dictation. It was a literary age. For the supposition that he could have *chosen* to write like a man "of quite elementary attainment" there could be no plausible ground — unless we suppose him to have wished to deceive his readers by giving his work the appearance of a translation; every educated man acquainted with the LXX knew the difference between translation Greek and the genuine article. The conjecture that *one* writer actually performed this bizarre feat might perhaps have seemed less incredible; but when we are shown half a dozen authors, all men of very obvious learning and literary skill, said to be attempting this task for which they were not fitted, it is time to seek a new theory.

The whole question as to the original language of the book has been given a new prominence and brought near to a final solution by Professor Burney's "Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel."¹ We have here, at last, a thoroughgoing, methodically sound argument by a competent scholar, designed to show that the idioms of the Fourth Gospel are not merely Semitic, but distinctly Aramaic, from the beginning of the book to its end. The author of the investigation, who is Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, and Canon of Rochester, has long been known to students of Biblical Hebrew through his writings in this field. He tells us in his introductory chapter how in recent years the conviction had grown upon him that the diction of the Fourth Gospel

¹ The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel, by the Rev. C. F. Burney, M.A., D.Litt. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1922. 176 pp.

needed closer and more expert attention than it had hitherto received; how he had been impressed by Lightfoot's remarks (Biblical Essays, pp. 126 ff.) on the language of the book, and by Dr. C. J. Ball's article 'Had the Fourth Gospel an Aramaic Archetype?' in the Expository Times for November, 1909; and how he finally was led to attack the question himself.

In order to prepare the way for his main argument, he presents first, in brief summary, a statistical comparison of the Marcan Aramaisms (which he assumes to be capable of demonstration) with those which he recognizes in John. He then proceeds to a detailed study of the prologue (1, 1-18), verse by verse, as a test of the theory of an Aramaic original. After a full discussion of the successive idioms, he turns the whole into an Aramaic corresponding to the Greek. Some suggestions in this direction had already been made, especially by Rendel Harris in the Expositor, vol. XII, 1916, pp. 156 f. In general, every Aramaic scholar will approve Burney's result here. What he attempted to prove, that the Greek fits closely at all points on genuine Aramaic idioms, he has proved. When he tries to show in addition that the prologue is "a hymn, written in eleven parallel couplets, with comments introduced here and there by the writer" (p. 40), he fails to convince the present reviewer.

Then follows his main argument, pp. 49-125. Beginning with the Sentence, Chap. II, he discusses successively asyndeton, parataxis, and the *casus pendens*, comparing the Johannine usage with Biblical and Rabbinic Aramaic, and classical and "Palestinian" Syriac. Chaps. III-VI then give similar treatment to the conjunctions, pronouns, verb, and negatives. This is all work of the utmost importance, thoroughly done; it will not have to be done over again. To me, it has an especially keen interest because I have long been convinced that we have before us merely the translation of an original Aramaic gospel, and for years past have been making collections like these of Professor Burney with the intention of publishing them as a part of my work, now far advanced, on the Aramaic origin of all four gospels, and a solution, from this point of view, of the Synoptic problem. I am now able to leave behind this funda-

mental demonstration in the Fourth Gospel, simply pointing to the work of Professor Burney, who has performed the task with such thoroughness and skill as I myself should not have equalled. He has shown, conclusively, that the idioms of the book are characteristically Aramaic throughout.

There follow two chapters, VII and VIII, on Mistranslations of the Original Aramaic, and Quotations from the Old Testament. Here it is not quite so easy to accept Burney's conclusions. As to the quotations, his final decision, expressed with some hesitation, is that they were originally given in Aramaic (p. 125). I think it can be shown, on the contrary, that the Old Testament quotations in John, as in the three Synoptic gospels and "I Acts" (Acts 1, 1-15, 35), were made in the original Hebrew. In deciding for Aramaic, as against Hebrew, Burney relies chiefly on his restoration of the original text of 7, 38 (see below). He also regards the *ʿna mē* in 12, 40 as the rendering of *נִלְכָּךְ* (p. 100). In what other way, however, should the Greek render Hebrew *לֵךְ*, seeing that 'lest' is always expressed by *ʿna mē* in this gospel, while *mēποτε* is never used?

The subject of mistranslations is of the very foremost importance, especially when the fact of the continuously underlying idiom has been fully demonstrated, as in the present case. It is not indispensable to find such errors, and there is always great danger that the searcher after them may create his own harvest, so many are the opportunities of misunderstanding; their evidential value, however, when they can be demonstrated, is great, and in a document of this length it certainly should be possible to find at least a few. Close translation, in any age of the world, is a highly difficult task; and the interpreter would be more than human who could render twenty-one chapters of *unpointed* Aramaic text into Greek without making any slips.

Burney first presents the rather numerous cases in which he finds ground for believing that the ambiguity of the relative particle *ܐܝܢ* has led to a mistaken rendering. In 1, 8; 5, 7; 6, 30; 50; 9, 36, and 14, 16, where the Greek has *ʿna*, he would render by 'who' or 'which'. In 8, 45; 9, 17, and possibly also 1, 16,

'who' instead of Greek ὅτι. In 12, 23; 13, 1; 16, 2; 32, 'when' instead of ἵνα. In 9, 8 and 12, 41, 'when' instead of ὅτι. Conversely, in 1, 4; 13 the relative pronoun should have been the conjunction, 'because, inasmuch as.' Burney also recognizes in 10, 29 (read 'who'), and 17, 11 f.; 24 ('those whom'), cases in which this ambiguous particle, used as a relative pronoun, was translated in an incorrect number or gender. Similarly, in 6, 37; 39 and 17, 2, where the meaning is 'every one who' or 'all those whom,' the Greek neuter, while perfectly defensible as a translation, would hardly have been written by one who was composing freely.

The rendering of this troublesome וְ (or perhaps rather וּ, the older form) is indeed a weak point in the Johannine Greek. Most of the examples cited by Burney would be seized upon at once by any expert investigator looking for evidence of translation. In 1, 13; 10, 29, and 17, 11 f. his interpretation, which is not to be obtained from the best attested Greek text, seems to me quite certain; and I should agree in some other instances where the Greek could nevertheless be defended, his emendation involving merely a stylistic improvement, not a substantially new interpretation. It does not seem to me, however, that defenders of the theory of an originally Greek gospel are likely to be convinced by any of these examples. The Greek conjunctions in question, especially ἵνα, are used so loosely in the later language that every variety of use in John — including such cases as 16, 2; 32 — could be defended by any one who felt defense to be necessary. There is occasionally room for argument over possible corruption in the Greek text, as in 10, 29. Beyond all this, the same exegetical considerations which led the translator to choose his neuter gender, or singular number, or causal conjunction, will govern the decision of many modern exegetes to hold by the present text.

Other suggested mistranslations are the following. 1, 5 and 12, 35, read 'darken' (*aqbel*) instead of 'apprehend' or 'overtake' (*qabbel*). — 1, 9, 'he was the true light,' הוּא instead of הָיָה (*hāy*). — 1, 15, instead of 'for he was before me' read 'because he was the first (of all).' — 1, 29, read 'behold the *child* of God.' — 2, 22, 'his disciples remembered that he *had* said

this.' (It is hardly necessary to suppose misunderstanding of the original text; the wide use of the Aramaic participle, so often rendered by the imperfect in John, would cover this case.) — 6, 63, 'the *things* about which I have been speaking to you.' — 7, 37 f., 'he that thirsteth, let him come unto me; and let him drink that believeth in me. As the Scripture hath said, Rivers shall flow forth from the fountain of living waters.' The emendation turns on the supposed confusion of ܦܝܬܐ 'fountain' with ܦܝܬܐ 'bowels.' But Burney's restored Aramaic is too far removed from the Greek, too improbable in itself, and not sufficiently like anything in the Old Testament. What is more important, I do not see how any translator could possibly make the blunder which Burney supposes. — 8, 56, 'your father Abraham *longed* to see my day.' The verb which Burney supposes here is not known to have occurred in Western Aramaic, and (if its use was like that in Syriac) would not easily have been misunderstood. — 9, 25, '*this* I know,' instead of 'one thing I know.' — 20, 2, 'I know not where they have laid him.' — 20, 18, 'announcing to the disciples that *she* had seen the Lord.'

I confess that I am unable to follow Burney in any one of these instances. In 1, 5 and 12, 35 (even without the added difficulty of supposing that the same rather unlikely blunder was made twice), 1, 15; 1, 29 (!); 6, 63, and 9, 25, I very decidedly prefer the present readings to those which Burney proposes. As for the remainder, his suggestion in 1, 9 seems to me most improbable because of the preceding verse. His conjectured ܐܝܢܐ would naturally refer to John the Baptist, even in the text which he restores (p. 41). In 20, 2 *οὐκ οἶδαμεν* is quite correct, I think, but means '*I* do not know.' I believe it to be an illustration of the characteristic delicacy in the use of the personal pronouns of which we have so many examples in the Semitic languages. Under certain circumstances it is common to avoid using the first person singular, under other circumstances the second person singular is replaced by the third, or by the second person plural. One of the most familiar illustrations is that mentioned by Dalman, (Grammatik, 2d ed., p. 108), the custom in the Galilean popular speech of substitut-

ing 'that person,' and the like, for 'I' and 'me.' Hebrew and Arabic furnish similar habits of speech; so also do Phoenician and old Western Aramaic, as I have shown elsewhere (ZAW, vol. 26, pp. 81ff.). In the present instance Mary Magdalene speaks modestly, as though her own personal knowledge were of minor importance — as indeed it was. I think that in 3, 2 (mentioned by Burney) Nicodemus, in the words in which he introduces himself to Jesus, also makes use of this modest form, οἶδαμεν, meaning — and understood as meaning — 'I know.' Jesus is thereupon represented as echoing his visitor's polite mode of speech when, in vs. 11, he begins to speak of himself and his own knowledge, using the plural number instead of saying 'I speak that which I know, and I testify what I have seen, and thou dost not receive my testimony.' The same substitution of 'we' for 'I' is well known in Greek (see, for example, Blass, § 48, 4), and is natural wherever the same feeling exists, as to a modest use of the first person singular, which we know to have been manifested in "the Galilean popular speech." — I think (or perhaps I should say, 'we think') that the text which Burney would emend in 20, 18 is quite correct, seeing that such sudden alternations of direct and indirect discourse are a common phenomenon in Semitic writings (cf. also Mark 6, 8 f., Acts 1, 4, Tobit 8, 21). The author conceived the passage in this way: 'Thereupon Mary Magdalene came and reported to the disciples, "I have seen the Lord!" and that he had said these things to her.'

It is tolerably certain that the skepticism which I have expressed as to these alleged mistranslations will be voiced even more decidedly by the hardened unbelievers whom Professor Burney and I are trying to convert. If the skepticism is justified, the capstone of his demonstration is wanting. Is the Fourth Gospel a translation? Granting the underlying Aramaic idiom, have we as yet convincing proof that the book, as it stands, is the Greek rendering of an Aramaic original? From the personal point of view gained from my own study of the Aramaic language, translation Greek, and the early New Testament writings, I should be entirely convinced by Burney's main argument, chaps. I–VI, if I had not already examined the

evidence in this gospel and reached the same conclusion. Those who are already inclined, or not disinclined, to believe will certainly be greatly impressed by the array of undeniable and most significant facts, reinforced by at least some of the suggested misrenderings of the Aramaic relative particle. On the other hand, the multitude of scholars who find it possible to believe that several New Testament writers, "John" among them, could by "thinking in Semitic while they wrote in Greek" achieve masterpieces of this calibre, and evidencing the profound knowledge of the Greek language which they certainly display, will hardly be disturbed in their position. Burney himself, I am surprised and disappointed to see, holds this view as possible, and thus saws deeply into the butt end of the limb on which he is sitting. He writes on p. 18: "Whether the Marcan Aramaisms prove actual translation from an original Aramaic document, as distinct from the virtual translation of a writer who, though using Greek as his medium of expression, is casting his words in the Aramaic mould which is more familiar to him, is a question which still remains open. The present writer, comparing the evidence for an Aramaic Marcan document with that which he himself adduces in this volume for an Aramaic Fourth Gospel, feels that the case for the former is not of equal cogency with that for the latter" (see also p. 8). And on p. 17: "Here [in Mark] we have the work . . . of a Palestinian Jew who either actually wrote in Aramaic, or whose mind was so moulded by Aramaic idiom that his Greek perforce reflected it." Whatever else may be said of this conception of literary possibilities, it puts the burden of *proof* squarely on demonstrated mistranslations. Nothing else can carry conviction. Can his suggestions (if they are regarded as important) as to the original meaning of 1, 13; 10, 29, and 17, 11 f. bear the strain which is thus put upon them? Every emendation based on the hypothesis of mistranslation has against it a strong general probability, and the claim to have produced convincing evidence will not be acknowledged in cases where the "troublesome" reading, which can be cleared away by this expedient, can easily be explained in other ways. Walter Bauer's "Johannesevangelium," which I have selected as con-

cise, fair, and representative of the prevailing view, shows no sign of misgiving in commenting on the passages just mentioned and evidently finds no difficulty in them. It is not surprising that Professor Burney, who always expresses himself with reserve, should speak as though not quite certain of the validity of his demonstration; cf. p. 20, top, with the sentence on p. 126 f. Once more in regard to Mark he writes on p. 19: "What is needed to substantiate the theory of an Aramaic original is some cogent evidence of mistranslation; and this has not as yet been advanced." It is true that Wellhausen failed to demonstrate the fact that the Second Gospel was translated from an Aramaic original; and in particular, that he did not succeed in finding important examples of mistranslation. Such examples are to be had, however, and the evidence of all kinds is decidedly stronger in the case of Mark than in that of John. Burney's argument, for all its learning and acumen, weakens at the crucial point; to use a sporting phrase, it "lacks the punch." Among those who are inclined to demand in John what Burney demands in Mark, I think that the verdict is likely to be, "Not proven."

In Chap. IX, entitled Epilogue, the final conclusions of the author as to the date, place of writing, and authorship of the gospel are stated and defended; and to these conclusions are added conjectures as to the origin of the other Johannine writings. He decides upon A.D. 75-80 as the probable date; since (p. 128) the gospel is the work of a man of mature Christian experience, and since (p. 129) "there seem to be no indications pointing to a date prior to the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70." (Are there any indications pointing to a date *subsequent* to that event?) For the place of writing he conjectures Antioch, on the ground that (p. 129) "the author was not writing, at least primarily, *for Jews*, but for a larger circle of Christians"; and because Antioch, being in an Aramaic-speaking country, would be suited to his theory of the original language. Further evidence in support of this view he finds in (1) the Johannine theology in the Epistles of Ignatius, and (2) traces of the same theology in the Odes of Solomon, recently conjectured by Rendel Harris to have been written at Antioch in the first century after Christ.

The author of the gospel Burney holds to have been "the other disciple," "the disciple whom Jesus loved," who is mentioned in it several times in such a significant manner. He does not, however, identify him with the son of Zebedee, but, following a line which others have taken, supposes him to have been a disciple unnamed in the gospels. A youth, he conjectures, an eyewitness and yet too young to be included among the Apostles, was the "beloved disciple." Emigrating to Antioch, he wrote his record in that city, and afterward journeyed on to Ephesus, where he appears as John the Presbyter. While in this region, in his last years, he may have produced the Epistles of John and the Apocalypse. (Burney expresses himself cautiously here, but sees good ground for the conjecture.) Attempting so late in life to adopt Greek "because of the exigencies of his new surroundings," he failed to master the language, and thus (!) achieved the extraordinary result which we see in the Apocalypse. The Epistles, which are in a very much smoother Greek, were presumably dictated to an amanuensis, who may also have been the translator of the gospel (pp. 137, 149 f.).

In thus transporting the author of the gospel to Ephesus, Burney places much reliance on the testimony of Irenaeus, which, as remarked above, is now so generally discredited by scholars. In deciding that Irenaeus, when he made mention of the John "who had seen the Lord," the John who was the author of the Fourth Gospel and the Apocalypse, and who lived at Ephesus until the times of Trajan, meant the Presbyter of Asia, never the son of Zebedee, Burney lays especial emphasis on the point that he *is never defined by name* as "Apostle," like Matthew, Peter, and Paul, in the forty or fifty passages where he is mentioned. Irenaeus does indeed in several passages (cited on p. 140) include this John *by inference* among the Apostles, and yet never styles him directly "John the Apostle," but always "John the disciple of the Lord," a designation for which Burney (p. 141) can find only the explanation that it was intended to *distinguish* him from the Apostles.

I think that there is a more probable explanation of Irenaeus's designation of the evangelist. How could any one read the four gospels thoughtfully without seeing that the author of

John was a "*disciple of the Lord*" in a sense in which the phrase could not possibly be applied to any one of the other three evangelists? On every page there is exhibited an intimacy with the thought of the Master which is not even approached elsewhere. Taking the record as true (and did not Irenaeus and his fellows thus regard it?), we have in this wonderful document a personal interpretation that testifies not merely to close and constant companionship, but also to the sympathy of the pupil whose mind is so richly endowed, and whose heart is so close to that of his teacher, that he is able to grasp and to expand in his own thought the teaching which another might not hear, or hearing could not comprehend. This wide difference between the Gospel of John on the one hand and the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke on the other is so clear and so striking that it fully accounts for Irenaeus's preference for the affectionate designation, "*the disciple of the Lord.*" There are many who sit in the privileged circle, but the mantle falls on one.

On page 129, in speaking of the probable date of the Fourth Gospel, Burney refers to the $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ in 5, 2, which has been thought to imply that the city was still standing intact, and says that the evidence of the present tense is "of doubtful validity if the Greek is regarded as a translation from Aramaic." I confess myself unable to share this view. The fact that $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ is inserted here between past tenses would seem to me to show that the translator was following the indication of his original. It would have been natural to employ the past tense here also, הוּא in Aramaic, $\eta\nu$ in Greek, as in 4, 5 ("*Jacob's well was there*"); 11, 18 ("*Bethany was about 15 stadia distant from Jerusalem*"); 3, 23 ("*there were many springs there*"); 11, 38 ("*the tomb was a cave*"); 19, 20 ("*the place was near the city*"); and similar instances. The $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota\upsilon$ in 5, 2 points to אֵינָה , as Burney surmises. In the Jewish Aramaic this word—uncombined, as it unquestionably must have been—regularly means '*there is,*' not '*there was.*' I do not believe that a writer who was aware that Jerusalem had been destroyed could have used the word here. I would add, as to the general question of the date, that to me, at least, it seems that the difficulty of

supposing the Fourth Gospel to have been composed after the year 70 is much greater than that which is encountered when it is assigned to an earlier period. On the supposition of the late date, how is it conceivable — to mention only one point among many — that the awful catastrophe of the destruction of the holy city, whether thought of as a calamity to the world or as a divine judgment on the unbelieving Jews, should receive not even the obscurest allusion?

Burney follows Dalman in laying great weight on the distinction between Aramaisms and Hebraisms (see pp. 7-17, and compare Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, pp. 13-34); not, however, as a means of differentiating among specimens of translation, but rather of distinguishing genuine translation Greek from the (imagined) Jewish-Greek sacred jargon of the Hellenist. That is, the presence of Hebraisms, as distinct from Aramaisms, in a New Testament writing is believed by these scholars to show that its author was not translating, but merely imitating the barbarous idioms of the LXX. The more numerous the Hebraisms, the surer the conclusion. Burney adds (p. 16) that he considers the matter to be of fundamental importance to his inquiry.

I hope to publish elsewhere what I have already written on this general subject; there is not space for it here, nor could I regard it as strictly relevant, since in my own view the demonstration of Hebraisms has only very slight significance of the sort demanded for it by Dalman and Burney, and can never be used as evidence that a given document is not a translation. In the first place, this formula for interpreting the Greek Semitisms ignores the probability that the idioms of the 'holy tongue' would have been at least as dear to the Nazarenes *who wrote in Aramaic* as to those who wrote in Greek. It was extremely natural that familiar Old Testament modes of speech should be imitated in these Palestinian writings which were intended to be in some sense the continuation and interpretation of the divine revelation to Israel. It must be remembered that the first Christian writers had reason to make contact, in this way, with the Hebrew scriptures; while the Rabbinical writers, on the contrary, would emphasize in every possible way

the unique character of the canonical writings; they would not, and did not, depart from current modes of speech in order to imitate the sacred style. There are other significant reasons, overlooked by Dalman and Burney, why the Rabbinical Aramaic cannot possibly be made the touchstone for determining the usage of Christian writers in the first century. Again, could not a *translator* (such as Luke) who was familiar with the LXX occasionally imitate Old Testament idioms in the Greek of his *translation*? The imitation would be far more likely under these circumstances than it would be if he were *composing* in Greek. It is almost always the case that the Hebrew idiom — as in the cases set forth by Burney in pp. 11–15 — is closely approached by an idiom of classical Aramaic, so that the rendering of the latter by the standing Greek equivalent of the former would be not only natural but entirely correct. For instance, the construction $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}$ with the infinitive (Dalman, p. 26; Burney, p. 12), which, though attested in Aramaic, was probably not often used, doubtless owes its frequent employment by Luke to the fact that he thus rendered the much-used $\text{כִּי} (\text{כֵּן})$ clause, often too awkward if literally transferred to Greek. Luke's accuracy is then beautifully vindicated by the Syriac version, which in turn renders the construction with $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\hat{\omega}$ and the infinitive by restoring the characteristic Aramaic כֵּן clause. This is only one instance out of a number. The locutions in question, moreover, are all genuine and widespread *Semitic* constructions (by no means limited to Hebrew), not at all out of keeping with the genius of the Aramaic tongue, as their Greek renderings are with the genius of Greek. Linguistic borrowings come and go, and form a notoriously difficult subject. Not one of the "pure Hebraisms" listed by Dalman (p. 29) is unknown in the Aramaic which we happen to possess; and we have no satisfactory ground for conjecturing how extensively they may have been used in the older *literary* Aramaic (not simply "the popular speech") of Palestine in the century just preceding the destruction of Jerusalem. Our standard grammars of the Biblical Aramaic still contain a list of "Hebraisms" which recent gain of knowledge has shown to be as truly Aramaic as Hebrew. Some originally Hebrew property has, of course, been com-

pletely assimilated by the other language. A few borrowings, traditionally designated as belonging peculiarly to Old Testament Aramaic, turn up now in the gospels. Thus, the phrase ענה ואמר, 'he answered and said,' so often used in Daniel, also found in Tobit, occurs in the same characteristic way in the four gospels, especially often in John (at least 26 times; Burney, p. 54), *not at all in the Rabbinic literature*. Dalman accordingly concludes (p. 20): "Die Wahrscheinlichkeit spricht dafür, dass echtes Aramäisch jene Formel nicht kannte. Dann können die Evangelisten sie nur direkt oder durch Vermittelung der griechischen Bibel aus dem Hebräischen entlehnt haben." What does he mean by "echtes Aramäisch"? We are dealing with the Jewish dialect at the beginning of the Christian era, and we certainly have no better source of information as to what it contained than the book of Daniel. Dalman's conclusion is a strange perversion of the evidence. In general, it is putting the investigation wrong-end-foremost to begin by making an arbitrary list of "unborrowed" Hebraisms, forbidding their use by writers of Aramaic in a period whose literature has perished, and whose literary motives are only imperfectly understood. We must first identify the few surviving translations, and then ascertain from them, as far as we can, what idioms their originals employed. I can find in Burney's discussion of the Hebraisms found in Luke merely information, often equivocal, as to the habits of a translator.

There are some minor points on which my own opinion would differ from Burney's; a small group compared with the large number of incidental observations which call out my assent and admiration. I strongly doubt the influence of the Targums which he would show on pp. 35 ff. I do not think that John's "logos-doctrine" can possibly be regarded as obtained from the Rabbinic *memra*, 'word,' or that it is in any sense "the development of conceptions enshrined in the Targums" (pp. 37 ff., 127). It is merely an isolated bit of Greek philosophy. The *memra* in the passages cited is nothing more than a circumlocution; neither here nor elsewhere is there any suggestion of hypostatization. I should venture to demur also when (p. 132, below) a connection is proposed between John's

mysticism and the Jewish Haggada (!), on the ground that "mysticism is one of the characteristics of the Rabbinic method of treating Scripture." I have no doubt that the author of the Fourth Gospel was a well educated man, but any mysticism that can be discovered in the Rabbinic exegesis is far removed from his mode of thought. In concluding with Burney's book I repeat what I have already said, that it is an exceedingly valuable and timely contribution to the solution of one of the most important problems of biblical science.

After dealing in what some will think a severe manner with Professor Burney's proposed specimens of mistranslation in the Fourth Gospel, it may seem presumptuous to attempt to add similar suggestions of my own. I have, however, for some years past been collecting seeming instances of the sort, and cannot well hesitate to produce at least a few of them here, in the hope of reinforcing Burney's argument and my own. I accordingly give a selection, reserving others, and perhaps a further defence of those presented here, for a future publication.

11, 33, 38, the scene in which Jesus comes to the tomb of Lazarus. The mental attitude of the Master, as he sees Mary and her friends weeping, and again, as he draws near to the tomb, is described by the phrases ἐνεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι and ἐμβριμώμενος ἐν ἑαυτῷ. The well known Greek verb means 'to be very angry, very indignant'; so, for instance, Thayer's Lexicon in the present passages. Various translations and commentaries have tried to evade this, but with no justification in either actual or probable usage. Walter Bauer, *Johannesevangelium*, holds fast to the Greek, as in duty bound, rendering by "ergrimmen," and explains the state of mind as the result of *lèse majesté*: "Jesus regards the bitter lamentation in the presence of the Prince of Life (vss. 25 f.) as doubt of his power, as insult to his majesty." And again, on vs. 38: "In renewed irritation (Erregung) at the expression of jesting skepticism, Jesus comes to the tomb." The picture of Jesus fuming with indignation over human faintheartedness in a time of deep affliction is intolerable, since it is untrue. Bauer and Thayer-Grimm are right, however, in maintaining that the Greek admits of no other meaning. The verb ἐμβριμάσθαι

renders, here and elsewhere, the root רנו (both Heb. and Aram.) which, as commonly used in Aramaic and Syriac, in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred signifies '*anger, wrath.*' The hundredth case, however, returns more nearly to the proper meaning of the root, 'quiver, shake, tremble, be agitated' (occasionally from joy, as well as from other emotions). The best parallel to the present passage is 2 Sam. 19, 1 (18, 33), describing the grief of King David when he heard the news of the death of his son Absalom: 'The king *was shaken to the depth of his soul* [רנו in both Hebrew and Targum], and went up to the chamber over the gate, weeping and lamenting as he went.' Cf. also, for the wider meaning of the word, Is. 14, 3; 9; 16; Jer. 33, 9; Deut. 28, 65, and other similar examples. In the original text of John, Jesus was described as '*deeply moved,*' and the Greek should have employed some such verb as *ἐταράχθη* (as in 13, 21); but the translator clung to the standard meaning of the Aramaic word.

We have similar mistranslations in Matt. 9, 30, *ἐνεβριμήθη*, and Mark 1, 43, *ἐμβριμησάμενος*, where the meaning of the original רנו, in the *af'el* stem, was '*to admonish sternly*' (literally, 'startle, cause to tremble'). Another example is Mark 3, 5, where μετ' ὀργῆς (!) renders בְּרִיגָה, '*in distress of soul.*'

7, 37 f. "He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, *out of his belly* (ἐκ τῆς κοιλίας αὐτοῦ) shall flow rivers of living water." Probably most readers of the passage, ancient and modern, have felt uneasy as to this "scripture," for it is not only unpleasing in itself, but also is not well suited to the present context. There is no known scriptural passage to which the citation, as it stands, can refer. It was long ago seen that a different arrangement of clauses is possible, but even so, the great difficulty remains. I would suggest that the original text was intended to read as follows: 'Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me; and let him drink who believeth on me. As the scripture hath said, *Out of the midst of her* [i.e. Jerusalem] shall flow rivers of living water.' The reference is plainly to Zech. 14, 8: "And it shall come to pass in that day [the Messianic time] that living waters shall go out from Jerusalem; half of them toward the eastern

sea, and half of them toward the western sea; in summer and in winter shall it be." This involves no change whatever in the consonant text, but simply the pointing מְנוּה instead of the (naturally expected) מְנוּהָ. The citation was evidently made for substance only, and therefore was not in Hebrew. This is the regular Aramaic word for the 'midst' of a city, both in Old Testament (Ezr. 4, 15) and Targums (Ps. 46, 6, "God is in the midst of her," מְנוּהָ). It is also very often used of human beings, meaning always the 'belly' or 'bowels,' i.e. exactly κοιλία.

7, 3. μετάβηθι ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ὑπάγε εἰς τὴν Ἰουδαίαν, ἵνα καὶ οἱ μαθηταί σου θεωρήσουσιν τὰ ἔργα σου ἃ ποιεῖς. This is obviously one of the countless cases of omission (accidental or mistaken) of the conjunction ו — a very small, but often very important, particle. The original text, at the point where the corruption occurred, read as follows: רַבִּי יְחִזְקִיָּהוּ תַלְמִידָךְ וְעַבְדְּךָ דִּי עָבַר אֲנִי. The brethren of Jesus said to him, ironically: 'Move hence, pass over into Judea; so that (men) may see thy disciples and the "works" which thou doest.' The subject of the verb is the indefinite third person plural, so often used in Aramaic. It could have been predicted with certainty that some readers — even very careful readers — of the Semitic text would make the mistake which lies before us in the Greek; not merely because the word 'disciples' stands in the place ordinarily occupied by the subject of the verb, but also because this would seem, at first sight, to be the logical subject. Any copyist would therefore have been likely to drop the ו.

8, 56. "Abraham rejoiced (ἡγαλλιάσατο) to see my day, and he saw it, and rejoiced" is a tautology that cannot have been in the original. What we should suppose the author to have written is "Abraham *desired*, or *prayed*, to see my day." One of the most familiar Aramaic verbs with the meaning 'exult, rejoice exceedingly.' is בָּעַ, the regular equivalent of the Hebrew גִּיל (e.g. in the Targums) and the Greek ἀγαλλιᾶσθαι. The most common verb with the meaning 'ask, seek, pray' is אָפַ. It seems plain that the latter verb was originally intended here, and that its final א was omitted in copying, partly because of the immediately following א (בעא אברהם), partly because

'Abraham *exulted* to see my day' seemed such a probable saying. But the author wrote '*prayed* that he might see.'

14, 2. A notoriously difficult verse. I would suggest as the original reading an Aramaic text of which the following is an exact translation: 'In my Father's house are many mansions. *It is necessary, I say to you, that I should go* to prepare a place for you.' Nothing could be better suited to the whole context than this. The text corresponding to the italicized words would be: ܠܝܬ ܐܚܝܬܐ ܕܝ ܐܬܝܬܐ. It is a remarkable fact, and hardly accidental, that *the very same text* yields our Greek if only ܠܝܬ is vocalized instead of ܠܝܬ: 'If not, would I tell you (or, have been telling you) that I go?'; the εἰπον rendering (quite correctly) the Aramaic participle in the characteristic use to which allusion has been made more than once in the preceding pages. This ܠܝܬ, 'to be fitting, necessary,' seems to have been less common in the Jewish dialects than in Syriac, where it is found frequently in the oldest monuments of the language, including the Lewisian ("Sinaitic") version of the four gospels, which has a strong Palestinian tinge. In judging as to the merits of the emendation here proposed, the parallel passage in 16, 7, in a strikingly similar context, should be compared: "Nevertheless, *I tell you the truth, it is expedient for you that I go away,*" where the Greek συμφέρει very likely renders this same ܠܝܬ. As for the supposed misunderstanding, even in classical Syriac there are probably at least a hundred occurrences of *wela* to one of *wale*; and the εἰ δὲ μή of 14, 2 would certainly not have seemed impossible here to a translator of that time, as it does to us. Observe, finally, that the very same abridged conditional clause consisting of the single word ܠܝܬ, 'but if not,' is found in 2 Sam. 13, 26 and 2 Kings 5, 17, in both cases rendered καὶ εἰ μή (the conclusion immediately following). A better parallel, showing how the mistake was made, could not be desired.

14, 31. The closing words of this verse, "Arise, let us go hence," furnish perhaps the most perplexing problem in the book. No one arises, no one goes out; no further notice is taken of the summons, either by the Master himself or by his

disciples. The discourse continues through three long chapters. Some scholars have suspected, very naturally, an accidental disarrangement of the material of the book; and have even experimented with transposition of chapters, always with disastrous results. The fact is, except for the three puzzling words, ἐγείρεσθε, ἄγωμεν ἐντεῦθεν, the connection here is perfect. The leading theme of chapter 14 is the announcement, *I must leave you and go hence*. Then follows chapter 15, with the theme, *Nevertheless, abide in me*. The one is the necessary continuation of the other. The three words just quoted cannot represent what the author of the book wrote at this point.

The immediate context makes the suggestion plausible that in vs. 31 Jesus was giving this first division of his discourse a suitable close by saying that the necessity laid upon him, of 'departing hence' (the main subject of the chapter), was in order that the world might know that he was the divine Son, fulfilling his Father's mission. The tragedy of his death would be the means of convincing mankind. For other passages where emphasis is put on this idea, see especially 8, 28 and 16, 10. Nowhere is the expression of the idea more in place than here in 14, 31. I would conjecture the following as the original reading, beginning with vs. 30: '*I will no longer speak much with you, . . . but in order that the world may know that I love the Father, and that as the Father gave me commandment, even so I do, I will arise and go hence.*' The Aramaic of vs. 31 would be: ודי ינדע עלמא די רחם אנה אבא וכמא די יהב לי אבא ודי ינדע עלמא די רחם אנה אבא וכמא די יהב לי אבא תפקידא בן עבר אנה אקום ואיל מפה. Is it not evident that a copyist, who failed to recognize the euphemism 'go hence,' with the redundant 'arise' (Dalman, *Worte Jesu*, p. 19), effected the very slight corruption of the text? His eye catching the characters קומו, it was easy for him to write the מפה קומו which our Greek translates.

20, 17. "Jesus saith to her, Touch me not, for I am not yet ascended unto the Father; but go unto my brethren," etc. These words of Jesus to Mary Magdalene are mystifying, to say the least. We might indeed have found his meaning comprehensible if he had said: '*Touch me*; for I have not yet as-

cended;' or, 'Touch me not, for *I am about to ascend*' (and therefore may not be approached in the same way as before). The Aramaic text corresponding to the Greek is the following: *לֹא תִקְרַבְנִי בְּדִי עַד לֹא סִלַּקְתָּ לְאַבָּא וְאַחֲלִי וְכוּ*. It is in all respects the correct text; but the Greek translation misses the meaning, because of the redundant conjunction *ו*, so frequently used in Palestinian writings, both Hebrew and Aramaic (in the Lewis Gospels found especially often introducing the continuation of a *בְּר*-clause, as here), and so often misleading to copyists and translators, ancient or modern. The true rendering is: 'Touch me not; (but) *before I ascend* (lit., *while I have not yet ascended*) to the Father, go unto my brethren,' etc.

Many other passages might be added, if space permitted, illustrating either mistranslation or accidental corruption of an Aramaic text. In 1, 51, I would suggest that *ἐπί* represents the same use of *על* which we see in Job 33, 23: 'If he have an angel to help him' (*עליו*, lit. 'over him'). That is, 'Ye shall see . . . the angels of God ascending and descending *in the service of the Son of Man*.'—1, 21; 25, *נְבִיא* should have been rendered 'a prophet'; the same form, with the same vocalization, is used for both the definite and the indefinite meaning of this noun. A similar correction must be made in the Greek of 7, 40. — 1, 28, Bethabara is correct, and the tradition of the locality was preserved, as we should expect that it would be. But the original Greek reading was unquestionably *Βηθαβια*. Instead of the original Aramaic *בית עניא עברא* the familiar *בית עניא* had been written, not necessarily by a careless scribe. I could point to inscriptions in Aramaic alphabets of about this period, in which the ease of confounding *ב* with *ג*, and *ר* with *י*, is very evident, and where decipherers have actually been in doubt as to the characters which were intended.—In 4, 6 and 13, 25, *οὕτως* is simply the Jewish-Aramaic *בְּכֵן*, 'therefore, accordingly.' — 12, 7, 'Let her alone; *should she keep it* for the day of my burial?'; imperative of *שבק* followed by imperfect tense *without* a conjunction; allowing either translation, but in the (usual) absence of any particle of interrogation the rendering of our Greek would be more natural.

These examples may suffice for the present. Even when they are taken by themselves they make a formidable group, for in each instance a serious difficulty in the traditional reading finds its obvious and easy solution in the Aramaic hypothesis. In no one of the passages discussed is it necessary to suppose carelessness or obtuseness on the part of either copyist or translator, or to postulate singular usage. In every chapter of the book, *including chap. 21*, there are numerous readings which receive their satisfactory explanation for the first time when the hypothesis of translation is applied to them. These facts, *taken in connection with all the evidence of other kinds*, seem to the present writer to prove conclusively that the Gospel of John was written in Aramaic, presumably in Palestine, and that our Greek text is both a close and a skilful translation.

THE LIBELLI OF THE DECIAN PERSECUTION¹

JOHN R. KNIPFING

OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY, COLUMBUS, OHIO

DESPITE the admirable "Licht vom Osten" of Adolf Deissmann and the more recent studies of Cumont, Bousset, Norden, and Reitzenstein, the student of the history of religions can still set his plough to much fruitful soil in the field of the papyri. Even the intensively cultivated domain of church history could be broadened and enriched by studies derived from such data in their application to problems of Christian institutional and constitutional development, of monasticism, and of the sociological aspects of the church's expansion. In another quarter, that of the persecutions, the papyri have helped to an understanding of the *genre littéraire* of the Acts of the Martyrs,² and to a more accurate conception of the relations of Roman state and Christian church. This last we owe particularly to the finds of Libelli from the period of the Decian persecution. The libellus was both private request and official attestation, or more specifically it was a petition (*βιβλίδιον*) of an inhabitant of the empire addressed to local authorities requesting that these countersign his declaration of pagan religious loyalty, and give written testimony of the pagan sacrifice performed by him in their presence, by adding their official attestation of loyalty and sacrifice.³ The first of these libelli was unearthed in 1893, just sixteen years after the Fayum became opened to the archaeologist's spade.⁴ Others followed in 1894,⁵

¹ This paper was read at the joint session on papyri of the American Historical Association and the Classical Associations, New Haven, Dec. 29, 1922.

² Cf. H. Delehay, *Les passions des martyrs et les genres littéraires*, Bruxelles, 1921, pp. 161-182 (with full bibliographical data).

³ Cf. U. Wilcken, *Grundzüge und Chrestomathie der Papyrskunde*, Leipzig, 1912, I, 2, p. 152; and Faulhaber, in *Zeitschr. für Kathol. Theol.*, XLIII (1919), p. 627.

⁴ First published by Krebs, in *Sitzungsberichte der Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1893, pp. 1007-1014. Best edition now Wilcken, *op. cit.*, I, 2, pp. 151 f.

⁵ Wessely, in *Anzeiger*, Vienna Academy, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1894, pp. 3 f., and in *Patrologia orientalis*, IV. 2 (1907), p. 118, no. 4.

1900,⁶ 1904,⁷ and 1907.⁸ These five, together with nineteen others newly acquired by the Hamburg City Library, were carefully edited by P. M. Meyer and published in the "Abhandlungen" of the Berlin Academy for 1910.⁹ Since that date seventeen more have come to light, thus making at the present writing a total of forty-one. Of these seventeen, ten have been published and seven remain unpublished; the former were printed in the years 1911,¹⁰ 1913,¹¹ 1915,¹² 1916,¹³ and 1917;¹⁴ the unprinted ones are distributed as follows: two at the University of Michigan,¹⁵ one at the University of Wisconsin,¹⁶ two in the Hamburg City Library,¹⁷ and two in the John Rylands Library at Manchester.¹⁸

A complete, though hypothetical, text of such a libellus, the composite result of a combination of the data of our forty-one texts, would read somewhat as follows:

1st Hand. To the commission of . . . chosen to superintend the (sacred offerings and) sacrifices. From . . . son (*or* daughter) of . . . (and of . . .) (together with his brother and their wives) (and his children), who comes from the village of . . . (in the division of . . .), and is domiciled in

⁶ Botti revealed its existence and content at the Second Congress of Christian Archaeologists, 1900. Cf. *Revue des études grecques*, 1901, p. 203. Published by Breccia in *Bulletin de la société arch. d'Alexandrie*, nouv. série, 1907. Best edition in Wilcken, *op. cit.*, I, 2, pp. 152 f. (no. 125).

⁷ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (ed. Grenfell and Hunt), IV, London, 1904, p. 49, no. 658.

⁸ Published by Wessely, in *Patrologia orientalis*, IV, 2, pp. 113-14, no. 1.

⁹ *Abhandlungen*, Preussische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1910, Anhang, Abhdlg. V.

¹⁰ *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library*, Manchester, I, 1911, p. 21, no. 12.

¹¹ *Amtliche Berichte aus den kgl. Kunstsammlungen zu Berlin*, 1913, col. 117.

¹² *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri*, John Rylands Library Manchester, II, 1915, pp. 94-96, nos. 112 a, b, c.

¹³ P. M. Meyer, *Griechische Texte aus Aegypten*, I, Berlin, 1916, pp. 77-79, nos. 15-17; and *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, XII, 1916, p. 190, no. 1464.

¹⁴ *Papiri greci e latini*, V, Florence, 1917, pp. 23-24, no. 453.

¹⁵ Professor Arthur S. Hunt of Oxford first informed me of the existence of the Michigan and Wisconsin papyri. Professor A. E. R. Boak of Michigan kindly sent me the two Michigan transcripts (inventory nos. 262 and 263).

¹⁶ Transcript made by Professor A. G. Laird of Wisconsin (inventory no. 59). The addition of the name of the month Payni is mine.

¹⁷ Inventory nos. 275 and 316. Professor P. M. Meyer of the University of Berlin kindly sent me his own transcripts.

¹⁸ Classified as 112 (d) and 112 (e). I use Meyer's transcripts.

the village of . . . (or in the . . . quarter of the city) (or dwelling beyond the town gates), (aged . . . years with a scar on the right eyebrow) (and member of the household of . . ., who functioned as exegete in the famous city of Alexandria, not to mention the offices he now holds) (or priestess of the god Petesouchos the great, the mighty, the immortal, and priestess of the gods in the . . . quarter). I (or we) have always and (all [my] life) without interruption sacrificed and poured libations and manifested piety toward the gods (in accordance with the divine decree), and now (again) in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree, I (or we) have made sacrifice and poured a libation (or poured a libation and sacrificed) and partaken of the sacred victims (in company with my wife and children) (acting through me). (Wherefore I present this petition and) I (or we) request you to certify this (for me, or for us) below. Farewell. I (or we) have presented this petition (aged . . . and injured) (or aged . . .) (and I . . . wrote in his behalf, for he is illiterate) (or *2d hand*, I . . . presented this petition, I . . . signed for him since he is illiterate).

2d Hand. I . . . (prytanis) (and I . . .) saw you sacrificing (together with your son, or sons).

3d Hand. I . . . have signed.

1st Hand. The year one of the emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, June 12 (or any date thereafter up to July 14).

From the foregoing it will be observed that the libellus was essentially a formal petition, validated by official signature and date. The petitions were probably written either in the hand of the petitioner himself or that of an intermediary or of a professional scribe. A regular formulary seems to have been followed, which called for the address, the name of the petitioner, his filiation, his place of birth and of residence, his personalia (such as age, identification marks, honorific employment), the declaration of religious loyalty and of sacrificial performance, and the complimentary close.

Meyer,¹⁹ in his edition of the nineteen Theadelphian libelli, declares that the nomographoi (notary publics) penned the entire petition (that is, the section of the libellus written by the 1st hand). He holds the same view regarding the three other libelli from Theadelphia which he edited and published in 1916.²⁰ Beside these twenty-two, there are twelve others of Theadelphian provenance, the formulas of none of which vary suffi-

¹⁹ *Abhandlungen*, Berlin Academy, 1910, p. 25.

²⁰ *Griechische Texte aus Aegypten*, I, pp. 75-76. Meyer states (p. 75) that six Theadelphian libelli went to Manchester, but, as he informs me by letter, in reality there were but five.

ciently to alter Meyer's conclusion.²¹ Seven libelli, however, remain, not drawn from Theadelphia: one from Alexandru Nesus,²² one from Philadelphia,²³ two from Oxyrhynchus,²⁴ two from Arsinoe,²⁵ and one from Narmouthis.²⁶ The first of these seven libelli contains the following addition after the farewell clause (διευτυχεῖτε): "I, Aurelius Diogenes [the petitioner], present the petition."²⁷ Wessely,²⁸ Bludau,²⁹ Franchi de' Cavalieri,³⁰ and Faulhaber³¹ identify this clause as the signature of the petitioner himself, and consequently as being different in handwriting from the rest of the petition immediately preceding it. Wilcken³² and Meyer,³³ both expert papyrologists, attribute the entire petition to the one handwriting — a view corroborated in 1916 by Meyer's publication³⁴ of the first of the three libelli of the University of Berlin, which contained a somewhat similar additional clause (written in a hand identical with the rest of the petition): "I, Aurelia Leulis, 35 years of age, have presented the petition."

Three other of the seven libelli under consideration contain additional variants. In one, the libellus from Philadelphia,³⁵

²¹ Plaumann (Amtliche Berichte aus den k. Kunstsammlungen zu Berlin, 1913, col. 119) is in accord with Meyer. So too Vitelli (Papiri greci e latini, V, p. 23).

²² Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2, pp. 151 f., no. 124.

²³ Wessely, in *Patrologia orientalis*, IV, 2 (1907), p. 118; and Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, 1910, pp. 31-32, no. 22.

²⁴ Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, p. 49, no. 658; XII, p. 190, no. 1464.

²⁵ Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2, pp. 152-153, no. 125; and Rylands papyri, Catalogue, I, p. 21, no. 12.

²⁶ Wisconsin papyri, inv. no. 59.

²⁷ Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2, no. 124, line 16.

²⁸ "Les plus anciens monuments du christianisme écrits sur papyrus," in *Patrologia orientalis*, IV, 2, p. 121.

²⁹ 'Die Libelli aus der Verfolgung des Decius,' in *Der Katholik*, XXXVIII (1908), p. 178.

³⁰ 'Due Libelli originali di libellatici,' in *Nuovo Bulletino di arch. crist.*, 1895, p. 72. Franchi holds that Aurelius Diogenes wrote the libellus himself.

³¹ 'Die Libelli in der Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius,' in *Zeitschrift für kath. Theologie*, XLIII (1919), pp. 627-629.

³² *Op. cit.*, I, 2, no. 124.

³³ *Loc. cit.*, p. 30, no. 21.

³⁴ Meyer, *Griechische Texte*, I, p. 77, no. 15.

³⁵ Wessely, *Patrologia orientalis*, IV, 2, p. 118, no. 4, lines 12-13.

a second hand has subjoined to the farewell clause of the petition the addition: "We, Aurelius Syrus and Aurelius Pasbeius, have presented the petition. I, Isidore, have signed for them, for they are illiterate." In another, the second libellus from Arisinoe,³⁶ the farewell is supplemented by the following clause written in another hand: "I, Aurelia Demos, have presented the petition. I, Aurelius Irenaeus [her husband] signed for her, since she is illiterate." In the third, from Oxyrhynchus³⁷ (entirely of one hand according to the editors), the document is dated, and then terminates in this fashion: "I, Aurelius Gaion, have presented the petition. I, Aurelius Sarapion, also called Chaeremon, signed in his behalf, since he is illiterate."

Does not the foregoing evidence show a certain lack of uniform methods in the writing and even in the formulation of the opening part of the libellus? If the Oxyrhynchus petition of Aurelius Gaion, the illiterate, was written by but one hand and signed by the proxy Sarapion, it is probable that the latter wrote the rest of the petition as well. On the other hand, we noted that the Philadelphian and Arsinoite libelli contained proxies' signatures in handwriting different from the first part of the petition. In these localities, it would seem, the scribe's signature for the petitioner had no legal validity, and the petition had to be signed by the petitioner himself or his legal proxy. It is possible that an Arsinoite libellus like that of Aurelia Ammonous,³⁸ priestess of the crocodile god Petesouchos, lacked such a signatory clause because it had been penned by the petitioner herself. Different places observed different procedure in detail, and consequently we cannot accept the generalization of Meyer,³⁹ that the petitionary section of the libellus had been written by professional scribes only. Perhaps a juster conclusion would ascribe the greater number of petitions to trained notaries, and an occasional one to the peti-

³⁶ Rylands papyri, Catalogue, I, p. 21, no. 12, lines 9-10.

³⁷ Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XII, p. 190, no. 1464, lines 14-17. Note also that the name 'Aure[lius]' is placed at the end of the line giving the date, another indication that the entire libellus was written by the same hand.

³⁸ Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2, pp. 152 f., no. 125.

³⁹ Abhandlungen, 1910, pp. 22, 25.

tioner himself or to his official intermediary.⁴⁰ Even with regard to the twenty-two Theadelphian libelli which Meyer has studied with special care, I find it difficult to accept his conclusions. On the basis of differences in handwriting and petitionary formulas he has inferred the existence of seven professional scribes.⁴¹ The proportion of seven classes for twenty-two examples is surprisingly high. But of these twenty-two extant libelli edited by Meyer, seven⁴² completely lack the petition, or major portion, and three others⁴³ are so fragmentary as to preclude drawing any reasonable conclusions. In other words, to follow Meyer, we may conclude that the little town of Theadelphia was so happily endowed with professional notaries that during a period of thirty-three days (from June 12 until July 14, 250) it could utilize the services of seven of them to draw up somewhat more than twelve petitions. The absurdity of such a view is palpable. A simpler and more rational explanation would allow for the private initiative of the petitioners themselves, who could readily have patterned their requests after the forms of the publicly posted imperial and local edicts.

Let us now examine in their sequence the various clauses and sections of the libelli. Each of these petitions opens with the address: "To the commission chosen to superintend the (sacred offerings and) sacrifices." This informs us that a local commission was instituted in the towns and villages of Egypt to prepare, superintend, and administer the vast machinery of universal sacrifice. We in the United States are at once reminded of the creation and functioning of our local and district Draft Boards, which consisted of three and five members respectively, and performed the task of conscripting the nation's eligible male population in 1917 and 1918. In Egypt the number of commissioners probably depended upon the size, wealth, and administrative importance of the village or

⁴⁰ So Faulhaber, *loc. cit.*, p. 627. Bludau (*loc. cit.*, p. 178) makes the all too sweeping generalization that the petition was written by the professional scribe and signed by the petitioner himself.

⁴¹ Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, 1910, pp. 25-27; *Griechische Texte*, p. 76.

⁴² Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, nos. 4, 7, 8, 9, 13, 15, and 20.

⁴³ *Ibid.*, nos. 3, 12, and 19.

town.⁴⁴ Twenty-five⁴⁵ of the total of thirty-four libelli extant from Theadelphia are certified by the hand of the grammateus (the secretary of the commission) and in the name of its two commissioners. Thus, "I, Aurelius Serenus, and I, Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing." To this is frequently added, evidently by the hand of the commissioner himself: "I, Hermas, have signed."⁴⁶ From these attestations Meyer⁴⁷ ingeniously concluded that Theadelphia had but two commissioners, for if the two named were merely functioning for a larger body, not only Hermas but also Serenus would have added his counter-signature.

Two other libelli, from Alexandru Nesus and Arsinoe respectively, are certified by local commissioners. That from Alexandru Nesus⁴⁸ reads: "I, Aurelius Syrus, have seen you and your son (*or* sons) sacrificing"; that from Arsinoe,⁴⁹ "I, Aurelius Sabinus, the prytanis, saw you sacrificing." This last quotation, with its reference to the prytanis, is interesting as an indication that the local town magistracy served on the commission for sacrificing. The prytanis was one of the annual metropolitan magistrates, who were called archontes, and he presided in his turn over the city council (βουλή).⁵⁰ From the analogy of the power which it exercised in nominating the municipal pontifices, we may conclude that the city council

⁴⁴ Foucart, 'Les certificats de sacrifice pendant la persécution de Decius (250),' in *Journal des Savants*, 1908, p. 175; cf. Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, p. 20.

⁴⁵ Namely Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, nos. 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15 (incomplete), 16, 20; Berlin Papyri (ed. Plaumann in *Amtliche Berichte*, 1913, 117); Rylands papyri, Catalogue, II, nos. 112 (a, b, c, d, and e); Meyer, *Griechische Texte*, nos. 15, 16, and 17; Pap. Flor., V, no. 453; Michigan papyri, inventory nos. 262-263; and Hamburg papyri, inventory no. 316.

⁴⁶ Contained in seventeen of the above-mentioned twenty-five.

⁴⁷ *Abhandlungen*, 1910, p. 22, n. 1.

⁴⁸ Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, I, 2, no. 124, lines 17-18.

⁴⁹ Rylands papyri, Catalogue, I, no. 12, line 12. The certifications cited — of Aurelius Syrus and Aurelius Sabinus — afford sufficient proof to refute Schoenaich's view that the commission attested to the correct religious behavior of the Christians toward the state-cult, but not to the individual's consummation of an act of sacrifice. Cf. Schoenaich, *Die Libelli und ihre Bedeutung für die Christenverfolgung des Kaisers Decius*, Glogau and Leipzig, 1910, pp. 9 f.

⁵⁰ Jouguet, *La vie municipale dans l'Égypte romaine*, Paris, 1911, pp. 37 f.; and Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, I, 1, p. 42.

likewise elected the commission in charge of the sacrifices. This too was an act thoroughly in accord with the conservative senatorial policy of Decius. Himself a member of the Roman Senate, he greatly respected its venerable past, trusted to its hearty coöperation in his projected regeneration of Roman state and society, and in proof of that trust had Valerian acclaimed as his civil colleague by the Senate and made subject to its vigilant control.⁵¹ Similarly, but with greater modesty, Decius might have relied upon the local municipal senates of Egypt and other parts of the empire for the realization of his programme of religious reform — evidently a favorite project in his restoration plans.⁵²

In Carthage the commission for sacrifices was made up of five leading citizens, who coöperated with the local magistrates.⁵³ The Greek Acts of Nestor⁵⁴ and Trypho⁵⁵ indicate a similar participation of the archontes, or magistrates, in the execution of the edict of Decius. Then, too, local archontes were subsequently entrusted with the administration of Maximinus Daja's persecution edict of 306, a decree which seems to have closely followed that of Decius.⁵⁶ At Smyrna the neocorus, or municipal pontifex for the imperial cult, headed the commission.⁵⁷ In general, the fusion of local magistracy and commission brought about a confusion of competencies; magisterial

⁵¹ G. Costa, s.v. Decius, in *De Ruggiero, Dizionario di antichità romane*, vol. II (1910), pp. 1486 f. Costa maintains, despite the fourth-century analogies discovered by Mommsen (*Staatsrecht*, II, 1, p. 338, n. 3), that the account in the *Hist. Aug. (vita Valeriani)*, 5,3-6, 9, ed. H. Peter) of Valerian's appointment as censor is historically founded.

⁵² K. J. Neumann (in *Orientalische Studien T. Nöldeke gewidmet*, II, Giessen, 1906, p. 835) holds negligible the view of Decius' attachment to the old Roman state-cult. Decius' general edict of persecution, however, and the contents of the libelli are sufficient proof to the contrary. Cf. Faulhaber, loc. cit., pp. 445-448; and Duchesne, *Hist. anc. de l'église*, I, 4th ed., p. 367 f.

⁵³ Cyprian, *Epist.* 43, 3 (ed. Hartel, in CSEL, 1871): *quinque primores illi qui edicto nuper magistratibus fuerant copulati*.

⁵⁴ *Acta Sanctorum*, February 3, pp. 633-635. Cp. P. Allard, *Dix leçons sur le martyr*, 2d ed., Paris, 1907, pp. 255 f.

⁵⁵ Franchi de' Cavalieri, 'Osservazioni sulle Leggende dei SS. Martiri Mena e Trifone,' in *Studi e Testi*, 19, Rome, 1908, p. 27, n. 1.

⁵⁶ Cf. Eusebius, *De mart. palest.*, 4, 8, the longer recension, ed. Schwartz, in *GCS, Eusebius' Werke*, 2. Band, 2. Teil (1908), p. 914, line 24.

⁵⁷ Cf. Passio Pionii, ch. 3, in Gebhardt, *Acta martyrum selecta*, Berlin, 1902, p. 97.

coercitio for the compulsion or punishment of recalcitrants might be exercised, in addition to the power of supervising sacrifices and certifying libelli.⁵⁸

The date of the commission's activity varied for different sections of the empire. In Egypt, as we learn from the libelli, the commission was active between June 12 and July 14, 250. In Smyrna it seems to have already existed by March 12, 250.⁵⁹ In the province of Pamphylia it was functioning by February 28, 250, the date of Nestor's martyrdom.⁶⁰ In Carthage it was probably still active during the second half of 250.⁶¹ These divergencies of date make it impossible to conclude with Harnack⁶² that the creation of a local commission was an integral part of Decius' lost edict of persecution. This edict had probably been promulgated as early as December 249, and it may be inferred that it had been framed in general terms, commanding all inhabitants of the empire to sacrifice to the gods — whether citizen or non-citizen, male or female, major or minor.⁶³ Even the names of the pagan deities were not specified to the sacrificers, for we know of offerings to the deified emperors, to Jupiter, to the triune cult of Jupiter, Juno, and Minerva, to the genius of the living emperor, to Apollo, to Diana, to Venus, and to the Nemeses.⁶⁴ The original edict

⁵⁸ This seems to be a reasonable interpretation of the evidence contained in the more authentic of the Decian *acta martyrum*. This evidence contradicts the view of Foucart (loc. cit., p. 176), that the sphere of the magistrate's power commenced only when the inhabitant had refused to sacrifice or had in some other way declared himself a Christian.

⁵⁹ On the date of the martyrdom of Pionius see Corssen, in *Zeitschrift f. d. neuest. Wissenschaft*, V (1904), pp. 266 ff.

⁶⁰ Cf. BHG, 1328. Cf. B. Aubé, *L'église et l'état dans la seconde moitié du III^e siècle*, Paris, 1885, p. 508. For date cf. also Tillemont, *Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire ecclésiastique*, III (1701), p. 309.

⁶¹ I base this date on Cyprian's use of the word 'nuper' in referring to the activities of the commission at Carthage. Cf. Ep. 43, 3 (ed. Hartel). Ritschl and Nelke, the chief authorities on the chronology of Cyprian's correspondence, both date the letter in March 251. Cf. O. Bardenheuer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Litteratur*, II, 1903, pp. 434 f.

⁶² *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1894, col. 41.

⁶³ See *infra*, p. 362.

⁶⁴ So Franchi de' Cavalieri, in *Studi e Testi*, 19, p. 37. Cf. Cyprian, Ep. 59, 13 and 18 (Carthage); De Lapsis, 24-25 (Carthage); Ep. 8, 2 and 21, 3 (Rome); also Passio Pionii, 2, 3, 5, 7, 8; *Martyrium S. Tryphonis*, ed. Franchi de' Cavalieri, in

could not even, as Gregg contends,⁶⁵ have specified the day "on which all the subjects of the empire must comply with the requirements of the edict," for the discrepancies in date of its publication and application for the different provinces of the empire are too considerable. It is possible that the sacrifice partook of the nature of a *supplicatio*,⁶⁶ but the analogy cannot be pressed too closely for the following reasons: (1) the commission, and the sacrifices performed under its surveillance, endured longer than the fifty days which constituted the maximum time-limit of a supplication; (2) the sacrifices of a supplication were voluntary on the part of the citizen population, not obligatory; and (3) they took the form of wine and incense offerings, but without meat.

Although we have concluded that Decius' general edict of persecution did not specifically provide for the creation of local sacrificial commissions, the evidence of their existence and the use of libelli — in Rome,⁶⁷ Carthage,⁶⁸ Spain,⁶⁹ and Alexandria⁷⁰ — is too general for us to believe them the chance creations of certain localities only. In all probability they were common to the entire empire, and had been directly provided for by the Roman imperial administration through a subsequent *novella* of instructions dispatched to the provincial governors.⁷¹ The local commissioners so created presided over the sacrifices, certified in the libelli to their due performance,

Studi e Testi, 19, p. 56, lines 7-8, p. 70, lines 2-3; Acta disputationis S. Achatii, 2, ed. Gebhardt, pp. 116 f.; Passio S. Saturnini, 4 (ed. Ruinart, 1859), p. 178; and Acta SS. Martyrum Petri, Andreae, Pauli et Dionysiae, 1-4 (ed. Ruinart), pp. 205 f. Technically speaking, the living emperor was not included among the *theoi*; sacrifices in his honor were to his genius, to his fortuna (*τύχη*), or pro salute. Cf. Blumenthal, 'Der ägyptische Kaiserkult,' in Archiv für Papyrusforschung, V (1913), p. 328.

⁶⁵ The Decian Persecution, Edinburgh, 1897, p. 73.

⁶⁶ On the supplication see especially J. Toutain, s.v., in Daremberg and Saglio, Dictionnaire des antiquités, IV, 2 (1911), pp. 1565-68; and Wissowa, Religion und Kultus der Römer, 2d ed., Munich, 1912, pp. 399 f.

⁶⁷ Cyprian, Ep. 30, 3.

⁶⁸ Cyprian, Ep. 55, 3, 14, 17, 20; De Lapsis, 8, 27, 28; Ad Fortunatum, 11.

⁶⁹ Cyprian, Ep. 67, 6.

⁷⁰ Eusebius, Hist. eccles. (ed. Schwartz), vi, 41, 11. Faulhaber (loc. cit., p. 451) has added Lugdunum to this list of places, on the testimony of O. Hirschfeld, Sitzungsberichte, Berlin Academy, 1895, I, pp. 396 f.

⁷¹ Cf. Meyer, Abhandlungen, 1910, p. 21.

and controlled the number and identity of sacrificers and non-sacrificers by means of the census and tax rolls.⁷²

These commissions were domiciliary, for their authority extended over all the inhabitants dwelling within their respective districts.⁷³ We are fortunate enough to have intact most of the names of the petitioners whose libelli have been preserved. These names are as follows:⁷⁴ Aurelius Diogenes (son of Satabous), Aurelius Syrus and Aurelius Pasbeius, together with their wives Demetria and Sarapias (Isidore signed), Aurelius L . . . thionus (son of Theodore and Pantonymis), together with his son Aurelius Discorus and his daughter Aurelia Lais, Aurelia Ammonous (daughter of Mystus), Aurelia Kamis, Aurelius Asesis (son of Serenus), Aurelia Ammonarion, together with her children Aurelius Didymus, Aurelius Noupheus, and Aurelius Taas, Aurelius Horion (son of Kiales), Aurelia Charis, Aurelius Alexander, Aurelius Serenis (son of Herodus), Aurelius Euprodokius (*oiketes* of Aurelius Apianus), Aurelia Taisis, Aurelia Thermouthis (daughter of Melanas), Aureli . . . , Aurelia Demos (fatherless, daughter of Helene, wife of Aurelius Irenaeus), Aurelia Soueris (daughter of Taisis), Aurelia Aoutis, Aurelia Isis (daughter of Anous), Aurelia Leulis (daughter of A . . . on), Aurelia Talimmis, together with her daughter, Aurelia E . . . s, together with her daughter Atous, Aurelius Gaion (son of Ammonius and Taeus), together with his wife Taos (?), his sons Ammonius and Ammonianus, and his daughter Thecla (Aurelius Sarapion, called Chaeremon, signed), Aurelia Teeieos, together with her daughter Tadeion, Inaris (daughter of Akios), together with her children, Ajas and Hera, Aurelia Belle (daughter of Peteres), together with her daughter Kaninis, Aurelius Auneios, and Aurelius . . . s.

An examination into the foregoing nomenclature may enlighten us on certain sociological conditions in the empire, on

⁷² Cf. H. Leclercq, s.v. Dèce, in *Dict. d'arch. chrét. et de liturgie*, fasc. xxxv-xxxvi (1916), col. 314; and Schoenaich, *op. cit.*, p. 10.

⁷³ This is made clear by some of the Theadelphian libelli, e.g., Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, no. 11: *παρὰ Ἀθηλίας Καμῖς ἀπὸ κώμης Φιλαγρίδος κατα[μέ]ρουσα ἐν κώμῃ Θεα[δε]λφείᾳ . . .*

⁷⁴ The names are given in the chronological order of publication of the respective libelli.

the contents of Decius' lost edict of persecution, and on the vexed problems of *dediticii* and *libellatici* respectively.

It will be noticed that our forty-one libelli transmit thirty petitioners' names intact. The names of women predominate over those of men in the proportion of seventeen to thirteen. For the single village of Theadelphia the proportion is two to one (fourteen to seven). These statistics, together with the fact that our libelli indicate frequent changes of domicile — nine petitioners having moved to Theadelphia from the neighboring Arsinoite villages of Philagris (two), Apias, Theoxenis (three), the Town of the Arabs, Dinnis, and Euhemeria, fully corroborate the general thesis of Oertel,⁷⁵ that the social and economic phases of decline in the Roman empire had become clearly marked by the middle of the third century.

Now with regard to the contents of Decius' lost edict of persecution, we are enlightened both by the petitionary formula and by the nomenclature of our libelli. In the one case we may follow most scholars ⁷⁶ in concluding that the declarations of past religious loyalty and of actual sacrificial performance had been specifically prescribed by the Decian edict of December 249.⁷⁷ The deposition of loyal religious observance (*caerimoniae*) in the past — the first instance of such a requirement in the history of the Christian persecutions — was probably made to affirm more effectively the deponent's pious regard for the gods in the present. In the libelli this deposition reads as follows: "I, the petitioner, have always and without interrup-

⁷⁵ Die Liturgie, Studien zur ptolemäischen und kaiserlichen Verwaltung Aegyptens, Leipzig, 1917.

⁷⁶ Cf. the above-cited works of Duchesne, Faulhaber, Foucart, Gregg, Harnack, Leclercq, Meyer, and Wessely. So too H. Achelis, Das Christentum in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten, II (1912), p. 267; Costa, Impero romano ed il cristianesimo, Rome, 1915, p. 40; Labriolle, Histoire de la littérature latine chrétienne, Paris, 1920, p. 198; Linsenmayer, Die Bekämpfung des Christentums durch den römischen Staat, Munich, 1905, pp. 132 f.; Manaresi, L'impero romano e il cristianesimo, Turin, 1914, p. 340; and Offord, in Ancient Egypt, 1917, p. 149.

⁷⁷ The date is based on the chronology and somewhat indefinite contents of Cyprian, Ep. 37, 2. The first half of January 250 is also possible, for the earliest martyrdom is that of Pope Fabian, January 20, 250. Cf. Duchesne, Liber Pontificalis, I (1886), p. 149, n. 8.

tion sacrificed, and poured libations, and manifested piety toward the gods."

The declaration of actual sacrificial performance marked another departure from the traditional practice of the Roman empire, in that the authorities had hitherto consistently refrained from imposing the actual worship of the state-cult upon its citizens and inhabitants.⁷⁸ Indeed, this action of Decius was somewhat paradoxical: its spirit reflected the exclusive and universal claims of the oriental religions; its purpose had in view the destruction or subjection of Christianity, the most threatening and obdurate of the oriental cults; and in its consequences it contributed to the further orientalization of the empire.⁷⁹ However, Decius' immediate impulse to persecution seems to have been not so much oriental as Balkan. In this respect he shared the military and political views of his fellow Thracians, Pannonians, Illyrians, and Dalmatians, and hence of Maximinus Thrax, Diocletian, Maximian, and Galerius. His chosen divine objects of sacrifice were the *di publici populi Romani*, not Mithras, Isis, or the Sol Invictus. In requiring such an outward act and declaration of adhesion to the state cult, Decius was exploiting for military and political purposes the extensive grant of Roman citizenship made by the *constitutio Antoniniana* of 212.

This last-mentioned grant of Caracalla in the form of an edict has been partly preserved in a Giessen papyrus.⁸⁰ It conferred the franchise upon all inhabitants of the empire excepting the *dediticii*. Precisely who made up this class of imperial disfranchised is still uncertain. In one case they are identified with the barbarians settled within the confines of the empire;⁸¹ in another, with those who paid the poll-tax;⁸² and in another,

⁷⁸ Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht*, 1899, pp. 568 f.; and Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 400.

⁷⁹ This is the elaboration of a suggestion of Professor W. S. Ferguson.

⁸⁰ Papyri Gissen., ed. Kornemann and P. M. Meyer, I. 2 (Leipzig, 1910), pp. 42-43, no. 40. The revised text in P. M. Meyer, *Juristische Papyri*, Berlin, 1920, pp. 1-2.

⁸¹ Cf. G. Bloch, *L'empire romain*, Paris, 1922, p. 208. Cf. Meyer (*op. cit.*, p. 1) for full bibliography on the problem.

⁸² Cf. Wilcken, in *Archiv für Papyrusforschung*, 1911, pp. 82-83; *id.*, *Grundzüge*, I, 1, pp. 57-60.

with the freedmen who had suffered legal disabilities for proved offenses.⁸³ Certainly Schubart⁸⁴ is wrong in saying of the native Egyptians: "They are *dediticii*, as the constitution of Caracalla declares." Our libelli prove the opposite, for all but one of the petitioners — the majority with distinctively Egyptian family names — have the *gentilicium* Aurelius or Aurelia to indicate that they owed their citizenship to the grant of M. Aurelius Antoninus Caracalla.⁸⁵

This, however, does not warrant the assumption of Harnack⁸⁶ and others⁸⁷ that Decius imposed the obligation to sacrifice exclusively upon those in possession of Roman citizenship, for we now possess the petition of a certain woman named Inaris,⁸⁸ who was without the Aurelian *gentilicium*, and may therefore have belonged to the imperial disfranchised or *dediticii*.

Our final problem, that of the possible identification of any *libellatici* on the basis of the nomenclature of the libelli, might be easier if we had a Christian prosopographia for the period to 325. The *libellatici*, as the literary sources inform us,⁸⁹ were the Christian renegades who had obtained a libellus, and had had it attested, without having actually performed the sacrifice. This group were distinguished from the *sacrificati*, or Christians who had actually sacrificed.⁹⁰ Since these sources and certain *acta martyrum* make note of the considerable number of these Christian renegades, it is quite possible that one or more of the petitioners of our forty-one libelli may have been a Christian. This, to be sure, is in complete opposition to Leclercq,⁹¹ who contends that the libelli now preserved were issued to tardy pagans,

⁸³ Cf. M. Radin, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans*, Phila., 1915, p. 361.

⁸⁴ *Einführung in die Papyrskunde*, Berlin, 1918, p. 269.

⁸⁵ Klebs, s.v. Aurelius, in *Pauly-Wissowa*, II (1896), col. 2431.

⁸⁶ *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 3. Aufl., Leipzig, 1915, II, p. 167.

⁸⁷ Kornemann, in *Gercke und Norden, Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, 2. Aufl., III (1914), p. 229; Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, 1910, pp. 19–20; Offord, loc. cit., p. 151; Plaumann, loc. cit., col. 120; and Preuschen, in *Handbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende*, hrsg. von G. Krüger, I, Tübingen, 1912, p. 107.

⁸⁸ *Michigan papyri*, inventory no. 262, line 3.

⁸⁹ Cyprian, Ep. 55, 13–14, 3, 17, 20; 30, 3; *De Lapsis*, 27–28. Cf. the illuminating commentary of Faulhaber (loc. cit., pp. 618–626) on these passages.

⁹⁰ Cyprian, *ibid.*

⁹¹ Loc. cit., cols. 336–337.

sick or unavoidably delayed; and that none of the libelli of apostatizing Christians survived, because the Christians themselves destroyed them when the persecution ended. The number of libelli we already possess, especially the thirty-four from the village of Theadelphia, makes Leclercq's theory improbable. Moreover, this considerable number, and the fact that we have two petitions which are seemingly identical and drawn in the name of one individual, Aurelia Charis,⁹² would seem to indicate that some, if not most, of our libelli were originally deposited in the local archives, and so put out of the reach of any Christian renegades who might have desired to destroy the proof of their apostasy. This is corroborated by the first of the Arsinoite libelli, which bears the archive number, 433.⁹³

The names, therefore, may be examined for any possible indication of the Christianity of the petitioner. Of the thirty-four names contained in the twenty-two Theadelphian libelli which are available for this purpose we find not one indubitably Christian name (such as Peter, Paul, Clement, John, Mark, Chrestos, Hosius, or Soter). Basing our inquiry upon Pape⁹⁴ and Bechtel⁹⁵ for the Greek, and Spiegelberg⁹⁶ for the Egyptian names, we may conclude that out of the thirty-four names but one is Roman (Serenus, or Serenis), eight are Greek (Didymus, Charis, Alexander, Herodus, Euprodokius, Melanas, Ajas, and Hera), and the others are Egyptian. Of these last, six are distinctly pagan, as we may infer from the names of the persons themselves or their children: Horion (Horus), Taesis ('she of Isis'), Thermouthis (that is, 'the harvest goddess'), Isis, Soueris (daughter of Taesis), and Inaris (mother of Ajas and Hera).

For Oxyrhynchus, which had become a devoutly and exclu-

⁹² Hamburg papyri, in Meyer, *Abhandlungen*, no. 6, pp. 7-8; and Berlin papyri, inventory no. 13430, ed. Plaumann, in *Amtliche Berichte aus den kgl. Kunstsammlungen zu Berlin*, 1913, col. 117.

⁹³ Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, I, 2, pp. 152-153, no. 125. Cf. *ibid.*, p. 153 (commentary); Bludau, in *Der Katholik*, 1908, p. 177; and Leclercq, *loc. cit.*, col. 320, n. 5.

⁹⁴ *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*, 3. Aufl., bearb. von Benseler, 1875.

⁹⁵ *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle, 1917.

⁹⁶ *Aegyptische und griechische Eigennamen aus Mumienetiketten der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig, 1901.

sively Christian community by the time of Rufinus,⁹⁷ we have the names of Theodore, Pantonymis, Dioscorus, Lais, Gaion, Ammonius, Taeus, Taos, Ammonianus, Thecla, and Sarapion called Chaeremon.⁹⁸ There seems to be a strong possibility that at least one of these two Oxyrhynchite libelli was presented by a Christian. In the first of the two we encounter the names of Theodore and Dioscorus — the former a name rather frequently employed by the early Christians, particularly of Egypt; the latter a name pagan enough in origin, but twice found in the correspondence of Dionysius of Alexandria.⁹⁹ In the second libellus the evidence is of greater independent value, for the petitioner's daughter is named Thecla. To follow Pape (s.v., based on Suidas) we may accept this as a Christian name; we are reminded of the popular martyr whom Christian legend and tradition have associated with Saint Paul in the apocryphal Acts of Paul and Thecla.¹⁰⁰ It seems logical to infer the Christian faith of Gaion, the petitioner himself, from the Christianity of his daughter Thecla. Gaion could not write, or at least so claimed, and consequently employed Sarapion, surnamed Chaeremon, to sign for him. Although the name Sarapion has a pagan connotation, the correspondence of bishop Dionysius of Alexandria makes mention of two Christians called Sarapion, the one a martyr, the other a *lapsus*.¹⁰¹ Bishop Chaeremon of Nilopolis suffered martyrdom under Decius.¹⁰² Christians appear to have occasionally resorted, even as early as 250, to the addition of another name, pious or at least neutral in character, in mitigation of names specifically pagan; thus the martyr Kronion (that is Zeus Kronion), surnamed Eunous (Εὐνους).¹⁰³ Similarly the more Christian surname, Chaeremon, mitigated the pagan character of the name Sarapion. Therefore from the Christian character of the names Thecla and Sarapion, surnamed Chaeremon, we may conclude

⁹⁷ Harnack, *Mission und Ausbreitung*, II, 3d ed., p. 173.

⁹⁸ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, IV, p. 49, no. 658; XII, p. 190, no. 1464.

⁹⁹ Eusebius, *Hist. eccles.* (ed. Schwartz), vi, 41, 19; vii, 11, 24.

¹⁰⁰ *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, ed. Lipsius, I (1891), pp. 235-272.

¹⁰¹ Eusebius, *op. cit.*, vi, 41, 8; vii, 44, 2.

¹⁰² *Ibid.*, vi, 42, 3.

¹⁰³ *Ibid.*, vi, 41, 15.

that this Oxyrhynchite libellus is an original document of Christian libellatici.

Five libelli remain to be considered from the point of view of the names: one from Alexandru Nesus, one from Philadelphia, one from Narmouthis, and two from Arsinoe. The following persons are concerned: Diogenes, Satabous, Syrus ('the Syrian'), Pasbeius, Demetria, Sarapias, Isidore, Auneius, Demus ('of the people'), Irenaeus, Ammonous, and Mystus. None of these names has any definitely Christian associations, with the possible exception of Irenaeus — a name associated with the well-known bishop of Lyons, and also found among the African bishops who met at the Carthaginian synod of 256.¹⁰⁴ This evidence, however, is inconclusive, for the name of Irenaeus was of Greek as well as Christian usage.

The petition of Aurelia Ammonous,¹⁰⁵ daughter of Mystus, is of much negative value, for it certainly proceeded from a devotee of paganism.¹⁰⁶ The following grounds establish the pagan character of her religion: (1) she describes herself in the libellus as priestess of the god Petesouchos,¹⁰⁷ the great, the mighty, the immortal, and priestess of the gods in the Moeris quarter of metropolitan Arsinoe; (2) these religious offices she administered at the moment of presenting the petition — otherwise instead of *ιερείας* in her formula of request we should read *ιερατευσάσης*; (3) she even accentuated the loyalty of her religious observances in the past with an addi-

¹⁰⁴ Cyprian, ed. Hartel, in CSEL, III, 1 (1868), p. 454: Irenaeus ab Vlulis.

¹⁰⁵ Wilcken, op. cit., I, 2, pp. 152-153, no. 125.

¹⁰⁶ See Faulhaber (loc. cit., p. 463, n. 3) for a list of writers who hold that the Decian edict was a command of sacrifice specifically addressed to the Christians. The list comprises Schoenaich, Bludau, Tillemont, Mosheim, Bekker, Peters, Görres, Schlemmer, Aubé, Allard, Harnack, Bihlmeyer, and Wilcken. I believe that he misrepresents the views of Wilcken (cf. Grundzüge, I, 2, p. 152): "wird anzunehmen sein, dass . . . Decius von allen Personen das vorgeschriebene Opfer verlangt hat." Achelis (op. cit., II, p. 267), Deissmann (Licht vom Osten, 1909, p. 24), Duchesne (op. cit., I, p. 368), Kirsch (s.v. Lapsi, in Catholic Ency., IX, p. 1), Monceaux (Hist. litt. de l'Afrique chrét., II (1902), p. 21), V. Schultze (s.v. Decius, in Hauck-Herzog, Realencyklopädie f. prot. Theol., XXIII (1913), p. 340) have likewise limited the edict to the Christians.

¹⁰⁷ Petesouchos was the crocodile-god and patron of the nome — the gift of Souchos, the crocodile-headed king and anthropomorphized god. Cf. Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 1, p. 106; and Hofer, s.v. Petesouchos, in Roscher, Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie, III, 2 (1902-09), cols. 2171-72.

tion (τὸν βίον), foreign to the formula of the other libelli — “all her life” had she sacrificed; (4) she could have been neither secretly a Christian, nor one suspected of Christian leanings — in the former case the daily and public performance of her priestly functions committed her to the renunciation of Christianity and exposed her to excommunication; in the latter, the execution of the libellus could not prove, nor effect, her loyalty to the state cult, for, to quote Foucart:¹⁰⁸ “*offrande de l’encens, libation, participation aux chairs des victimes, mais c’étaient les actes qu’on lui voyait accomplir journellement dans son ministère, et les renouveler devant la commission n’aurait rien prouvé.*”

This investigation of the nomenclature of the libelli shows that Decius’ original edict of persecution had been framed in general terms, with the command that all inhabitants whether Christian or pagan, citizen or non-citizen, male or female, major or minor, should sacrifice to the gods, a command which served as a model for two later edicts of the persecution of Diocletian, namely, the fourth edict of the year 304 and the fifth of the winter of 305–306.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Eusebius, *De mart. palest.*, ed. Schwartz, in GCS, 3, 1, p. 910, line 4; and the longer recension, ed. Schwartz, 4, 8, p. 914, lines 23 and 25.

TEXT AND TRANSLATION OF THE FORTY-ONE EXTANT
LIBELLI OF THE DECIAN PERSECUTION¹⁰⁹

No. 1. Pap. Berolin. (1893.) Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2,
No. 124, pp. 151-152.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρη-
μένοις κώμ(ης) Ἀλεξ(άνδρου) Νήσου
παρὰ Αὐρήλ(ιου) Διογένου Σατα-
βοῦτος ἀπὸ κώμ(ης) Ἀλεξάνδ(ρου)

5 Νήσου ὡς (ἐτῶν) οβ οὐλ(ή)

ὀφρῦι δεξ(ιᾷ). καὶ ἀεὶ

θύων τοῖς θεοῖς διαιτέ-

λεσα καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ πα-

ροῦσιν ὑμέϊν κατὰ

10 τὰ προστετατα[γμέ-]

να ἔθυσα [κα]ῖ ἔ[σ]π[εισα]

[κ]αὶ τῶν ἱ[ε]ρείων [ἐγεν-]

σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑ[μᾶς]

ὑποσημιώσασθαι.

15 διευτυχεῖται.

Αὐρήλ(ιος) [Δι]ογένους ἐπιδ[έδωκα].

2d Hand. Αὐρή[λιος] Σῦρος ἰδ[όν] σε]

θύοντα ἅμα ν[ῖ]ψ[ι].

3d Hand. . . . ωνος . . . [. . .

1st Hand. 20 [ἐτους α'] Αὐτοκράτορο[ς] Καί[σαρος]

[Γα]ίου Μεσσίου Κ[ο]ιν[του]

[Τρ]αι[ανοῦ] Δε[κίου] Εὐσ[εβοῦς]

[Ε]ὐτ[υχοῦς] Σε[β]α[σ]τοῦ

ἐπ[εὶ]φ[ι] β.-

1st Hand. To the commission of the village of Alexandru Nesus, chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Diogenes, son of Satabous, of the village of Alexandru Nesus, aged 72 years, with a scar on the right eyebrow. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell. I, Aurelius Diogenes, have presented this petition.

¹⁰⁹ The libelli are given in the chronological order of their publication; the seven unpublished ones come at the end. The lines of the papyrus originals are followed. Square brackets [] indicate lacunae or mistaken omissions in the original; parentheses () indicate the resolution of an abbreviation; points in the place of letters in the text itself indicate letters lost, deleted, mutilated, or illegible.

2d Hand. I, Aurelius Syrus, saw you and your son sacrificing.

3d Hand. . . . onos. . . .

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Epeiph 2 (June 26, 250).

No. 2. Pap. Rainer (1894). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 22, pp. 31-32.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις
κώμης Φιλαδελφίας
παρὰ Αὐρηλίων Σύρου καὶ Πασβείου τοῦ
ἀδελφοῦ καὶ Δημητρίας καὶ Σαραπιάδος
5 γυναικῶν ἡμῶν ἐξωπυλειτῶν.
ἀεὶ θύοντες τοῖς θεοῖς διετελέ-
σαμεν καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα καὶ ἐσπίσαμεν
καὶ [τῶ]ν ἱ[ερείων] ἐγενσάμεθα καὶ
10 [ἀξιοῦμεν ὑμᾶς ὑποσημιά-]
σασθαι ἡμῖν. διεντυ[χεῖτε].

2d Hand. Αὐρή(λιος) Σύρος καὶ Πασβῆς ἐπιδεδώκ(αμεν).
Ἰσιδωρος ἔγρα(ψα) ὑπ(έρ) αὐτ(ῶν) ἀγρα(μμάτων).

1st Hand. To the commission of the village of Philadelphia, chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Syrus and Aurelius Pasbeius, his brother, and of Demetria and Sarapias, our wives, dwelling beyond the town gates. We have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree we have poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. We request you to certify this for us below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Syrus and Aurelius Pasbeius, presented this petition. I, Isidore, wrote in their behalf, for they are illiterate.

No 3. Pap. Alexandrin. (1900). Wilcken, Grundzüge, I, 2, No. 125, pp. 152-153.

υλγ.
τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Ἀμμο-
5 νοῦτος Μύστου ἱε-
ρείας Περεσούχου θεοῦ
μεγάλου μεγάλου ἀειζώ[ν]ου

- καὶ τῶν ἐ[ν Μ]οῆρει θεῶν
 [ἀ]πὸ ἀμ[φόδο]υ Μοήρεως. ἀεὶ
 10 [μ] ἐν θύ[ο]υσ[α] τοῖς θεοῖς δι-
 [ε] τέλεσα τὸν βίον, ἐπὶ δὴ
 [κ]αὶ νῦν κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέν-
 [ντ]α καὶ ἐπὶ παρόντων
 [ὑμ]ῶν ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπισα
 15 [κ]αὶ τῶν ἱερ[ε]ῶν ἐγευσά-
 [μην] καὶ [ἀξι]ῶ ὑποση-
 [μιώ]σασθα[ι].

433. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Ammonous, daughter of Mystus, of the Moeris quarter, priestess of the god Petesouchos, the great, the mighty, the immortal, and priestess of the gods in the Moeris quarter. I have sacrificed to the gods all my life and without interruption, and now again, in accordance with the decree and in your presence, I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below.

No. 4. Pap. Oxyrh. (1904). Oxyrhynchus Papyri, IV, No. 658, p. 49.

- 1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ ἱερ[ε]ῶν [καὶ]
 θυσιῶν πόλ[εως]
 παρ' Αὐρηλίου Ἀ[. . .]
 θίωνος Θεοδώρου μη[τρὸς]
 5 Παντωννμίδος ἀπὸ τῆ[ς]
 αὐτῆς πόλεως. ἀεὶ μὲν
 θύων καὶ σπένδων [το]ῖς
 θεοῖς [δ]ιετελ[εσα] ἔ[τι] δὲ
 καὶ νῦν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν
 10 κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέν[ε]ν[τα]
 ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα κα[ὶ]
 τῶν ἱερ[ε]ῶν ἐγευσάμην
 ἅμα τῷ νῦν μου Αὐρη-
 λίῳ Διοσκόρῳ καὶ τῇ
 15 θυγατρὶ μου Αὐρηλίᾳ
 Λατῖδι. ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς ὑπο-
 σημιώσασθαί μοι.
 (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσίου Κύντου
 20 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου

Εὐσεβοῦ[ς Εὐ]τυχοῦς
[Σεβασ]τοῦ [παῦ]νι κ.

2d Hand. [. . .]ν.

1st Hand. To the commission in charge of the sacred victims and sacrifices of the town. From Aurelius L . . . thion, son of Theodore and Pantonymis, his mother, of the same town. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and poured libations to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the decree I have poured a libation, and sacrificed, and partaken of the sacred victims, together with my son, Aurelius Dioscorus, and my daughter Aurelia Lais. I request you to certify this for me below. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 20 (June 14, 250).

2d Hand. . . . n.

No. 5. Pap. Wessely (1907). *Patrologia Orientalis*, IV, 2, No. 1, pp. 113-114.

1st Hand. [τοῖς ἐπὶ] τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡ[ρῳμέ]νοις
π(αρὰ) Αὐρηλίας Καμὶς ἀπὸ
κώμης Φιλαγρίδος κατα-
5 [μέ]νουσα ἐν κώμῃ Θεα-
[δελ]φείᾳ. αἰ θίουσα τοῖς
[θεοῦ]ς διετέλεσα καὶ νῦν
[ἐπὶ π]αρ[ό]ντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα
10 [έ]θυσα καὶ ἔσπεισα καὶ]
[τ]ῶν ἱερείων ἐγενσάμην.
καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς ὑποσημι-
[ώσασ]θαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερῆνος καὶ
15 [Ε]ρμᾶς εἶδαμεν ὑ-
μᾶς θυσιάζοντος.

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κουίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
20 [Εὐτ]υχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι
κη'.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Kamis, born in the village of Philagris, domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance

with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 28 (June 22, 250).

No. 6. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., 1910, No. 1, p. 4.

1st Hand. τ[οῖ]ς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις
παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Ἀσήσεως Σερή-
νου ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφίας.
καὶ αἰὲ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς θύων
5 διατετέλεκα καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ πα-
ροῦσιν ὑμῖν κατὰ τὰ προσ-
ταχθέντα ἔσπισα καὶ
ἔθυσα καὶ τῶν ἱερέων
ἐγευσάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
10 ὑποσημιώσασθαι μοι.
διευτυχεῖται.

Ἀσῆσις ὥς (ἔτων) λβ ἐπισυνῆς.
2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς
εἶδαμέν σοι θύωντα.

3d Hand. 15 ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου
Μεσσίου Κονίντου Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου
Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι ιη.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Asesis, son of Serenus, of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and sacrificed and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. Farewell. I, Asesis, am 32 years of age, and injured.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 18 (June 12, 250).

No. 7. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 2, p. 5.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις
π(αρά) Αὐρηλίας Ἀμμωναρίου
ἀπὸ κώ(μης) Θεαδελφείας. καὶ ἀεὶ
μὲν θύουσα καὶ εὐσεβοῦσα
5 τοῖς θεοῖς σὺν τοῖς τέκ(νοῖς) Αὐρηλ(ίοις)
Διδύμου καὶ Νουφίου καὶ
Ταᾶτος διετετελέκαμεν
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων
ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέν-
10 τα ἐσπίσαμεν καὶ ἐθύσα-
μεν καὶ τῶν ἱερέων ἐ-
γενεσάμεθα καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημιώσασθαί μοι.
διεντυχεῖται.

2d Hand. 15 Αὐρήλιοι Σερῆνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς εἶδα-
μεν ὑμᾶς θυσιάσοντας.

3d Hand. ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κύντου Τραιανοῦ
20 Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι κ̄.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Ammonarion of the village of Theadelphia. I and my children, Aurelius Didymus, Aurelius Noupheus, and Aurelius Taas, have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree we have poured libations, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 20 (June 14, 250).

No. 8. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 3, p. 6.

Fragment (a). κα]ι [εὐσ]ε-
[βοῦσ]α τοῖς θεοῖς διετετέλεκα
[καὶ ν]ῦν ἐπὶ παρόντ[ων ὑ-]
[μῶν]

Fragment (b). (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυνίντου

Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνη κ."

Fragment (a). And I have shown piety to the gods without interruption, and now in your presence . . .

Fragment (b). The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 20 (June 14, 250).

No. 9. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 4, p. 6.

(ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκρ[ά]τορος Καίσαρος

Γαίου Μεσσίου Κουνίντου

Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς

Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνη κα.

The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 21 (June 15, 250).

No. 10. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 5, pp. 6-7.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
π(αρά) Αὐρηλίου Ὀρίωνος
Κιαλῆ ἀπὸ κώμης

5 Ἀπιάδος καταμένων
ἐν κώμῃ Θεαδελφείᾳ.
αἱ θύων τοῖς θεοῖς διε-
τέλεσα καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόν-
των ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰ προσ-
10 ταχθέντα ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπει-
σα καὶ τῶν ἱερείων ἐγεν-
σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημιώσασθαι. διευ-
τυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. 15 Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμῆς
εἶδαμεν σοι θυσιάσοντα.

3d Hand. ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

Γαίου Μεσσίου Κουνίντου

20 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς

Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνη.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Horion, son of Kiales, born in the village of Apias and domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice and poured a libation and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni (between May 26 and June 24, 250).

No. 11. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 6, pp. 7-8.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσι-
 ῶν ἡρήμενοις
 παρὰ Αὐρήλιας Χάρι-
 τος ἀπὸ κώμης Θε-
 5 ἀδελφείας. καὶ αἰ μὲν
 θύουσα καὶ εὐσεβοῦ-
 σα τοῖς θεοῖς διατε-
 τέλεκα καὶ νῦν ἐ-
 πὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
 10 κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα
 ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα καὶ
 τῶν ἱερείων ἐγεν-
 σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
 ὑποσημιώσασθαί μοι.
 15 διεντυχεῖται.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς
 εἶδαμέν σε θυσιάσοντα.

3d Hand. ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος

20 Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυνίου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου
 Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς
 Σεβαστοῦ παύνη κβ.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Charis of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and

now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and sacrificed, and partaken of the sacred victims. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 22 (June 16, 250).

No. 12. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 7, p. 8.

2d Hand. Δύρηλιοι Σερήνος καὶ
 Ἐρμᾶς εἶδαμέν σε θυσιά-
 σοντα.

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
 δ Γαίου Μεσσίου Κονίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
 Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι
 κγ'.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 23 (June 17, 250).

No. 13. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 8, p. 9.

(ἔτους) α' [Αὐτο]κράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαί[ου] Μεσσίου Κονίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι κέ.

The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 25 (June 19, 250).

No. 14. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 9, p. 9.

[ἔτους α' Α]ὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρο[ς]
[Γαί]ου Μεσσίου [Κυ]λίντου
[Τρ]αιαν[οῦ] Δεκίου Εὐσεβ[οῦς]
[Εὐτ]υχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι κε.

The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 25 (June 19, 250).

No. 15. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl. No. 10, pp. 9-10.

- 1st Hand.* τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
π(αρά) Αὐρηλίου Ἀλ(εξάνδρου) ἀπὸ κώμης
Θεαδελφείας. αἱ θύων
5 τοῖς θεοῖς διετέλεσα
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων
ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰ προστα-
χθέντα ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσ-
πεισα καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν
10 ἐγευσάμην καὶ ἀξιώ
ὑμᾶς ὑποσημιώσασθαι.
διευτυχεῖτε.
2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ
Ἐρμᾶς εἶδαμέν σε θυσι-
15 ᾶζοντα.
1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κουίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνι
20 κς'.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Alexander of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 27 (June 21, 250).

No. 16. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 12, pp. 11-12.

- 1st Hand.* [3 lines of illegible letters]
μὲν κ[αὶ τῶν] ἱερ[εῖ]ων ἐ-
5 γευσάμε[θ]α [κ]αὶ ἀξιώ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημι[ώ]σα[σθαί μοι].
δι[ευ]τυχεῖτα[ι].

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνο[ς κα]ὶ Ἑρμῆς
 εἶδαμεν ὑμᾶς θ[υ]σιάζοντας.

3rd Hand. 10 ΕΡΜΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
 Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνι κθ'.

1st Hand. . . . and we have partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 29 (June 23, 250).

No. 17. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 13, p. 12.

(ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκ[ράτ]ορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσίου Κουίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
 Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ

5 παύνι κθ'.

The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 29 (June 23, 250).

No. 18. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 14, pp. 12-13.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρη-
 μένοις
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίου Σερήνις
 Ἡρώδου ἀπὸ κώμης Θεοξέ-
 5 νίδος καταμένοντος
 ἐν κώμῃ Θεαδελφίᾳ. αἰὲ μὲν
 θεοῖς θύω[ν] καὶ
 εὐσεβῶ[ν] διατετέλεκα καὶ νῦν
 ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑ-
 10 μῶν κατὰ τὰ προσ[τ]αχθέν-
 τα ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα
 καὶ τῶν ἱερίων ἐγενεσά-
 μην καὶ ἀξιώ ὑμᾶς ὑπο-
 σημιώσασθαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. 15 [Α]ὐρήλιοι Σεργήν[ο]ς καὶ Ἑρμᾶς
[εἰδαμέ]ν σε θυ[σιάζον]τα.

3d Hand. [EPM]ΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτ[ο]κράτορος Καίσαρος
Γάλου Μεσ[σ]ίου Κυίντου

20 Τραι[ανο]ῦ Δεκίου Εὐ[σ]εβοῦς

Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ

πα[ρ]ῖνι κθ.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Serenis, son of Herodus, born in the village of Theoxenis and domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods and shown piety, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 29 (June 23, 250).

No. 19. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 15, p. 13.

2d Hand. [εἰδ]αμεν [ὑμ]ᾶς θυσιάζοντ[ος].

3d Hand. E[P]ΜΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτ(ορος) Κ(α)ίσαρος
Γάλου Μεσσίου κυίντου

5 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβ(ο)ῦς

Εὐτυχ(ο)ῦς Σε(βα)στοῦ πα[ρ]ῖνι κ-.

2d Hand. We saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 2- (between June 15 and 24, 250).

No. 20. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 16, pp. 14-15.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν

ἡρημένοις

παρὰ Αὐρηλ(ίου) Εὐπροδοκίου

οἰκ[έ]του Αὐρηλ(ίου) Ἀπριανοῦ

5 ἐξη(γητεύσαντος) τῆς λα(μπροτάτης) πόλ(εως) τῶν
 Ἀλεξ(ανδρέων) κ(α)ὶ ὡς χρη(ματίζει) καταμένων
 ἐν . . Θεαδελφία. αἰ
 θύων τοῖς θεοῖς κ(α)ὶ νῦν
 ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν

10 κατὰ προσταχθέντα
 ἔθυσα κ(α)ὶ ἔσπεισα
 καὶ τῶν ἱερ[εῖ]ων ἐγενεσά-
 μην κ(α)ὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
 ὑποσιμῶσασθαι.

15 διευτυχ(εῖται).

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σ[ε]ρήνος καὶ
 Ἑρμᾶς εἶδαμέν σε
 θυσιάζοντα

3rd Hand. ΕΡΜΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand 20 (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτ(ορος) Κ(α)ίσ(αρ)ος
 Γαίου Μεσ[σ]ίου Κυί(ντο)υ Τρ(αιανο)ῦ Δ(εκίου)
 Εὐσεβ[οῦ]ς Εὐτυχ[οῦ]ς
 Σε(βα)στοῦ ἐπεῖφ κ⁻.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Euprodokius, member of the household of Aurelius Apianus, who functioned as exegete of the far-famed city of Alexandria, not to mention the offices he now holds. I am domiciled in Theadelphia. I have always sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Epeiph 20 (July 14, 250).

No. 21. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 17, pp. 15-16.

τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
 ἡρήμενοις π(αρά)
 Αὐρηλίας Ταῆσις ἀπὸ
 κώμης Ἀράβων κατα-
 5 μένων ἐν κώμῃ Θε-

ἀδελφεία. αἰ θύουσα
 τοῖς θεοῖς διετέλεσα καὶ
 νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
 κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα
 10 ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπεισα καὶ τῶν
 ἱερείων ἐγενσάμην καὶ
 ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς ὑποσημιώσασ-
 θαι. διευτυχε[ῖ]τε.

To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Taesis, born in the village of the Arabs, now domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

No. 22. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 18, p. 16.

τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
 ἡρημένοις
 παρὰ Ἀβρηλ(ίας) Θερμοῦθews
 Μελανᾶ ἀπὸ κώμης
 5 Θεοξενίδος. αἰ θύ-
 ων τοῖς θεοῖς καὶ
 νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων
 ὑμ[ῶ]ν κατὰ προσταχθέν-
 τα ἔθυσα κ(α)ὶ ἔσπεισα
 10 κ(α)ὶ τῶν ἱερ[εῖ]ων ἐγενσά-
 μην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
 [ὑποσημιώ]σασθαι.
 [διευτυχ]εῖται.

To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Thermouthis, daughter of Melanas, of the village of Theoxenis. I have always sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below.

No. 23. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 19, p. 17.

τοῖς ἐπὶ θυσιῶ[ν ἡρημένοις κώ-]
 μης Θεαδ[ελφείας] παρὰ Ἀβρηλ[ι] . .

To the commission of the village of Theadelphia, chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aureli . .

No. 24. Pap. Hamburg. (1910). Meyer, Abhandl., No. 20, p. 17.

2d Hand. [Αὐρήλι]οι Σερήνος καὶ
[Ἑρμᾶς εἰ]δαμέν σε
[θυσιά] ζονται.

3rd Hand. ΕΡΜΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand. 5 (ἔτους)α'

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one

No. 25. Pap. Rylands (1911). Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, No. 12, p. 21.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Δημῶτος ἀπάτορος
μητρὸς Ἑλένης γυνὴ Αὐρηλίου Εἰρηναίου
ἀπὸ ἀμφόδου Ἑλληνηλεον. καὶ αἰεὶ θύουσα τοῖς
5 θεοῖς διετέλεσα καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παροῦσι ὑμῖν
κατὰ τὰ προστετ[α]γμένα καὶ ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπι-
σα καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐγευσάμην καὶ ἀξείω
ὑμᾶς ὑποσημιώσασθαι μοι. διευτυχεῖται.

2d Hand. Αὐρηλία Δημῶς ἐπιδέδωκα. Αὐρήλ(ιος)

10 Ε[ἰ]ρηναῖος ἔγραψα ὑπὲρ αὐτῆς ἀγρα(μμάτου).

3rd Hand. Αὐ[ρή]λ(ιος) Σαβεῖνος πρύτ(ανις) ε[ἰ] δ[ό]ν σε θύουσαν.

1st Hand. (ἔτους)α Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου Μεσσίου
Κυίντου Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς
Σ[ε]βαστοῦ παῦνι κ.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Demos, fatherless, daughter of Helen and wife of Aurelius Irenaeus, of the Hellencion quarter. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. Farewell.

2d Hand. I, Aurelia Demos, have presented this petition. I, Aurelius Irenaeus, wrote in her behalf, for she is illiterate.

3d Hand. I, Aurelius Sabinus, the prytanis, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 20 (June 14, 250).

No. 26. Pap. Berolin. (1913). Plaumann, Amtliche Berichte aus den kgl. Kunstsammlungen zu Berlin, col. 117.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
παρὰ Δύρηλίας Χάριτος
ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφείας.

5 καὶ αἰ μὲν θύουσα καὶ
εὐσεβοῦσα τοῖς θεοῖς
διατετέλεκα καὶ νῦν
ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέν-

10 τα ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα
καὶ τῶν ἱερείων ἐγευ-
σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημιώσασθαι μοι.
διευτυχεῖται.

2d Hand. 15 Δύρηλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρ-
μᾶς εἶδαμέν σε θυσιάσοντα.

3rd Hand. ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυίντου

20 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι κβ.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Charis of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 22 (June 16, 250).

No. 27. Pap. Rylands (1915). Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Vol. II, No. 112 (a), p. 94.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοις
παρὰ Δύρηλίας Σονήλεως μητρὸς

Ταήσεως ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελφείας.
καὶ αἰὲ μὲν θύουσα καὶ εὐσεβοῦσα τοῖς

5 θεοῖς διετελεσα καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόν-
των ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέν-
τα [ἐ]θύσα καὶ ἔσπισα καὶ τῶν ἱε-
ρείων ἐγενεσάμην, καὶ [ἀ]ξιῶ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημιώσασθαι. διευτυχεῖται.

2d Hand. 10 Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς εἶδαμέν σε θυσι-
άζοντος.

3rd Hand. Ἑρμᾶς σ(εσ)η(μείωμαι).

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος Γαίου
Μεσσίου Κυνίντου Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου

15 Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παύνη κς.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Souelis, daughter of Taesis, of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have sacrificed, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 26 (June 20, 250).

No. 28. Pap. Rylands (1915). Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Vol. II, No. 112 (b), p. 95.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν [θ]υσι[ῶν]
ῥημένους
π(αρά) Αὐρήλιου Ἀούτews
ἀπὸ κώμης Δίννεως

5 καταμένων ἐν κώμῃ
Θεαδελφείᾳ. αἰ θύων
τοῖς θεοῖς διετελεσα καὶ
νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα

10 ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπισα καὶ
τῶν ἱερείων ἐγενεσάμην,
καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς ὑποσημιώ-
σασθαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

- 2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἐρ-
 15 μᾶς εἶδαμέν σοι θυσιάσονται.
 3rd Hand. Ἐρμ(ᾶς) σεσημ(είωμαι).
 1st Hand. (ἔτους)α Αὐτοκράτορ[ο]ς Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσί[ο]υ Κονίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δε[κί]ου Ε[ύσεβ]οῦς[.]

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Aoutis, born in the village of Dinnis, domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius.

No. 29. Pap. Rylands (1915). Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, Vol. II, No. 112 (c), pp. 95-96.

- 1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρη-
 μένους
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Ἰσεΐτος
 Ἀνοῦτος ἀπὸ κώμης Θεαδελ-
 5 φίας. αἰ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς
 θύω καὶ εὐσεβῶ διατελοῦσα,
 καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
 κατὰ τὰ προ[σ]ταχθέντα ἔσπισα
 καὶ ἔθυσα καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν
 10 ἐγενεσάμην, καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
 ὑποσημιώσασθαι. διευ-
 τυχέιτε.
 2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἐρμᾶς
 εἶδαμέν σε θυσιάζοντα.
 3rd Hand. 15 Ἐρμᾶς σ(εσ)η(μείωμαι).
 1st Hand. (ἔτους)α Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσί[ο]υ Κυνίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβ[ο]ῦς
 Εὐτυχ[ο]ῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι κη.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Isis, daughter of Anous, of the village of Theadelphia. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 28 (June 22, 250).

No. 30. Pap. Univ. Berolin. (1916). Meyer, Griechische Texte aus Aegypten. I. Papyri des neutestamentlichen Seminars der Universität Berlins, No. 15, p. 77.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἡρημένοι(ς)
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Λευλῖς Ἄ . . γος
ἀπὸ κώμης Εὐημερίας
τῆς Θεμίστου μερίδος. αἰ τοῖς θε-

5 οῖς θύουσα καὶ ἐπιτελοῦσα
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑ-
μῶν κατὰ τὰ προστεταγμέ-
να ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπεισα καὶ
τῶν ἱερείων ἐγευσάμην

10 σὺν τοῖς ἀφήλιξι μου τέ-
κνοις Παλέμπε καὶ
Τ . . . ηρι. διὸ ἐπιδίδωμι
ἀξιούσα ὑμῶν λαβεῖν τὴν
ὑποσημίωσιν. διευτυχεῖτ(ε).

15 Αὐρηλία Λευλῖς ἐπιδέδωκα
ἑτῶν τριάκοντα πέντε.

2d Hand. καταμένων ἐπὶ κώ(μης) Θεαδελφίας.

3rd Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερῆνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς εἰ-
δαμέν σε θυσιάζοντα.

1st Hand. 20 (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦ(ς)
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ ἐπεὶ
γ'.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Leulis, daughter of A. . . on of the division of Themistes in the village of Euhemeria. I have always sacrificed to the gods and discharged my religious duties, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I, together with my children, both minors, Palempis and T. . . eris, have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. Wherefore I present this petition and request you to undertake to certify this below. Farewell. I, Aurelia Leulis, aged 35, have presented this petition.

2d Hand. Being domiciled in the village of Theadelphia.

3d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Epeiph 3 (June 27, 250).

No. 31. Pap. Univ. Berolin. (1916). Meyer, Griechische Texte aus Aegypten. I. Papyri des neutestamentlichen Seminars der Universität Berlins, No. 16, p. 78.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
π(αρά) Αὐρηλίας Ταλίμμις
καὶ σοῦ θυγατρὸς. ἀὶ θύουσαι
5 τοῖς θεοῖς διετελέσαμεν
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα
ἔθυσα καὶ ἔσπεισα καὶ τῶν
ιερέων ἐγενσάμην καὶ
10 ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶ[ς ὑ]ποσημιάσασ-
θ[α]ι. διε[ντυχεῖ]τε.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς
εἶδαμεν ὑμᾶς θυσιάσοντος.

3rd Hand. ΕΡΜΣΕΣΗΜ

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Talimmi and her daughter. We have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

No. 32. Pap. Univ. Berolin. (1916). Meyer, Griechische Texte aus Aegypten. I. Papyri des neutestamentlichen Seminars der Universität Berlins, No. 17, pp. 78-79.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπ[ι τ]ῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοι[s]
π(αρά) Αὐρη[λία]s 'Ε . . . s
ἅμα τῇ θυγατρὶ 'Ατοῦδι

5 ἀπὸ κώμης Φιλαγρίδος.
ἀλ θύο[υσ]αι τοῖς θεοῖς διετε-
λέσαμ[ε]ν καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόν-
των ὑμῶν κατὰ τὰ
προσταχθέντα ἐθύσαμεν

10 καὶ ἐσπείσαμεν καὶ τῶν
ιερείων ἐγευσάμεθα
καὶ ἀξιοῦμεν ὑμᾶς ὑποση-
μῶσ[ας] θαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. Αὐρ[ή]λιοι Σερήνος

15 [καὶ 'Ερμ]ᾶς εἶδαμεν
ὑμ[ᾶς] θυσιάζοντος.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia E . . . s, together with her daughter Atous of the village of Philagris. We have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree we have made sacrifice, and poured libations, and partaken of the sacred victims. We request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

No. 33. Pap. Oxyrh. (1916). Oxyrhynchus Papyri, XII, No. 1464, p. 190.

[τοῖς] ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν αἰρεθείσι τῆς
[Ὀ]ξύρυγχειτῶν πόλεως
[παρ]ὰ Αὐρηλίου Γαιῶνος Ἀμμωνίου
[μη]τρὸς Ταεῦτος. ἀεὶ μὲν θύειν καὶ
5 [σπέ]νδειν καὶ σέβειν θεοῖς εἰθισμένος
[κατ]ὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς θείας κρίσεως
[καὶ] νῦν ἐνώπιον ὑμῶν θύων καὶ σπέν-
[δω]ν καὶ γευσ[ά]μενος τῶν ιερείων ἅμα
[Τα?] ὥτι γυναικὶ [κ]αὶ Ἀμμωνίῳ καὶ Ἀμμο-
10 [νι]ανῶ υἱοῖς καὶ Θέκλῃ θυγατρὶ δι' ἐμοῦ κ[α]ὶ

- [ἀξι]ῶ ὑποσημώσασθαι μοι. (ἔτους) α
 [Αὐ]τοκράτορος Κ[α]ί[σαρο]ς Γαίου Μεσσίου
 [Κυί]ντου Τ[ρ]αιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
 [Εὐ]τυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ ἐπεὶ γ. Αὐρή[λιος]
 15 [Γαι]ῶν ἐπιδέδωκα. Αὐρήλ(ιος) Σαραπίων
 [ὁ καὶ] Χαιρήμων ἔγρα[ψα] ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ μὴ [εἰδὲ-]
 [τος] γράμματα.

To the commission of Oxyrhynchus chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Gaion, son of Ammonius and Taeus. I have always been accustomed to sacrifice and pour libations and worship the gods in accordance with the command of the divine decree, and now in your presence I, together with my wife, Taos (?), my sons, Ammonius and Ammonianus, and my daughter, Thecla, acting through me, sacrifice, and pour a libation, and partook of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me below. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Epeiph 3 (June 27, 250). I, Aurelius Gaion, have presented this petition. I, Aurelius Sarapion, also called Chaeremon, wrote in his behalf, for he is illiterate.

No. 34. Pap. Florent. (1917). Papiri greci e latini, V, No. 453, pp. 23-24.

- 1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
 ἡρημένοις
 παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Τεειηούτος ἀ-
 πὸ κώ(μης) Θεαδελφείας σὺν τῇ
 5 θυγ(ατρὶ) Ταδείου. καὶ αἰ μὲν
 θύουσα καὶ εὐσεβοῦσα
 τοῖς θεοῖς διετέλεσα καὶ
 νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑ-
 μῶν κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέν-
 10 τα ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα
 καὶ τῶν ἱερείων ἐγευσά-
 μην καὶ ἀξιώ ὑμᾶς ὑπο-
 σημώσασθαι μοι.
 διευτυχεῖται.
 2d Hand. 15 Αὐρήλιοι Σερῆνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς εἴ-
 δαμεν ὑμᾶς θυσιάζοντος.
 (ἔτους) α Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσίου Κονίντου
 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
 20 Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ παῦνι κ-.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelia Teeieous (?) of the village of Theadelphia, together with her daughter Tadeion. I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for me. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 2· (between June 14 and 24, 250).

No. 35. Pap. Michigan (unpublished). The University of Michigan Library, Inv. no. 262.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶν
ἡρημένοις
παρ' Ἰνάρους Ἀκι[ο]ς ἀπὸ
κώμης Θεοξενίδος
5 ἅμα τοῖς τέκνοις Ἀϊανι
καὶ Ἡρα καταμένοντες
ἐν κώμῃ Θεαδελφείᾳ.
'Α[ε]ῖ θύοντες τοῖς θεοῖς
διετέλεσαμεν καὶ νῦν
10 ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσταχθέντα ἐθύσαμεν
καὶ ἐσπέσαμεν
καὶ τῶν ἱερέων ἐγευσά-
μεθα καὶ ἀξιούμεν ὑμᾶς
15 ὑποσημιώσασθαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ
Ἑρμᾶς εἶδαμεν ὑμᾶς
θυσιάζοντας.

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α̅ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
20 Γαίου [Με]σίου Κονίντου
Τραϊα[νο]ῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι κγ̅.

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Inaris, daughter of Akios of the village of Theoxenis, together with her children, Ajas and Hera, all being domiciled in the village of Theadelphia. We have always and without interruption

sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree we have made sacrifice, and poured libations, and partaken of the sacred victims. We request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 23 (June 17, 250).

No. 36. Pap. Michigan (unpublished). The University of Michigan Library, Inv. no. 263.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ [θ]υσίων κώμης
[Θ]εαδελφίας
παρὰ Αὐρηλίας Βέλλης
Πετερήως καὶ ἡ ταύτης θύγατερ
5 Κανίνις. ἀ[ε]ὶ θύ-
ουσε τοῖς θεοῖς διετε-
λέσαμεν καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ
παρόντων ὑμῶν κατὰ
προστεταγμένα

10 ἔσπ[ε]ισα καὶ ἔθυσα καὶ
ἐγευσάμην τῶν ἱερ-
είων καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
ὑποσημ[ε]νώσαστε ἡμῖν.
διευτυχ(εῖτε).

2d Hand. 15 Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς εἶδα-
μεν ὑμᾶς θυσιάζοντος.

3rd Hand. Ἑρμᾶς ση(μειοῦμαι).

1st Hand. (ἔτους) ᾧ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσ[σ]ίου Κ[ο]νίντου
20 Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι κς̄.

1st Hand. To the commission of the village of Theadelphia superintending the sacrifices. From Aurelia Belle, daughter of Peteres, and her daughter Kaninis. We have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this for us below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 27 (June 21, 250).

No. 37. Pap. Wisconsin (unpublished). The University of Wisconsin Library, Inv. No. 59.

1st Hand. τοῖς ἐπὶ τῶν θυσιῶ[ν ἥρη-]
 μένοισ κώ(μης) Ναρμ[οῖθε] ὡς
 παρὰ Αὐρη[λί]ου Αὐν[είους?] . .
 ν[ι]ο]ν ἀπὸ κώμης Ναρμού(θε-)
 5 ὡς. αἰὲ μὲν τοῖς θεοῖς θύων
 δ[ι]ατετέλεκα καὶ νῦν δέ
 κατὰ τὰ κελευσθέντα ἐπὶ πα-
 ρ[ο]ῦσιν ὑμῖν ἔθυσ[α καὶ ἔ-]
 σπ[ει]σα καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐγευ-
 10 σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶ[ς] ὑπο-
 σημιώσα[σ]θαι. διε[ν]τυχ(εῖτε).
 Α[ὐ]νῆς ὡς (ἐτῶν) . . .
 . . . [. .].

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι . . .
 15
 [. . .] . . .
 [. . .] . . .
3rd Hand. [. . .] ὡνι
 [. . .] . . .

1st Hand. 20 (ἔτους) α' Αὐτο[κρ]άτορος Καίσαρος
 Γαίου Μεσσί[ο]ν Κνί[ντου]
 Τραιανοῦ Δ[ε]κί[ο]ν Εὐσεβοῦς]
 Εὐτυχοῦς Σ[ε]βαστ[οῦ]
 πα[ύ]ν¹¹⁰

1st Hand. To the commission of the village of Narmouthis chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius Aunes, son of . . . of the village of Narmouthis. I have always and without interruption sacrificed to the gods, and now in accordance with the edict's decree in your presence I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell. I, Aunes, aged . . .

2d Hand. We, Aurelius . . .

3d Hand.

¹¹⁰ The addition of the name of the month is mine.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni . . .

No. 38. Pap. Hamburg.¹¹¹ (unpublished). Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, Inv. No. 275.

(ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μ[ε]σίου Κουίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
5 παῦνι ιθ'.

The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 19 (June 13, 250).

No. 39. Pap. Hamburg. (unpublished). Hamburger Stadtbibliothek, Inv. No. 316.

1st Hand. καὶ τῶν ἱερ[ε]ῶν ἐ-
γενσάμεθα καὶ ἀξι-
οῦμεν ὑμᾶς ὑπο-
σιμιώσασθαι. διεν-
5 τυχεῖται.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρμάς
εἶδαμεν ὑμᾶς θυσιάζον-
τος.

3rd Hand. ΕΡΜΑΣ ΣΗ

1st Hand. 10 (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος
Καίσαρος Γαίου Μεσίου
Κουίντου Τραιανοῦ
Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ
παῦνι κζ'.

1st Hand. And we have partaken of the sacred victims. We request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

3d Hand. I, Hermas, certify it.

¹¹¹ This libellus and the three which follow (nos. 39, 40, and 41) I owe to the courtesy of Professor P. M. Meyer of the University of Berlin. In regard to the two unpublished Rylands libelli (nos. 40 and 41) he has written me, Dec. 2, 1922: "Da meine Lesungen in aller Schnelligkeit erfolgt sind und ich sie nicht nachprüfen konnte, bitte ich Sie, nicht auf etwaige Abweichungen von der definitiven Lesung hinweisen zu wollen."

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 27 (June 21, 250).

No. 40. Pap. Rylands (unpublished). John Rylands Library, Manchester, No. 112 (d).

1st Hand. ἐπὶ παρόντων ὑμῶν
κατὰ τὰ προσ[τ]αχθέντα
ἔσπισα καὶ ἔθυσα
καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν ἐγευ-

5 σάμην καὶ ἀξιῶ
ὑμᾶς ὑποση-
μιώσασθαι. διευτυχεῖτε.

2d Hand. Αὐρήλιοι Σερήνος καὶ Ἑρ-
μᾶς εἶδαμέν σε θυσιά-

10 ζοντα.

1st Hand. (ἔτους) α' Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος
Γαίου Μεσσίου Κυίντου
Τραιανοῦ Δεκίου Εὐσεβοῦς
Εὐτυχοῦς Σεβαστοῦ

15 παῦνι κζ'.

1st Hand. In your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have poured a libation, and made sacrifice, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas, saw you sacrificing.

1st Hand. The year one of the Emperor Caesar Gaius Messius Quintus Trajanus Decius Pius Felix Augustus, Payni 27 (June 21, 250).

No. 41. Pap. Rylands (unpublished). John Rylands Library, Manchester, No. 112 (e).

1st Hand. τοῖς[ἐπὶ τ]ῶν θ[υσιῶ]ν
ἡρη[μέ]νοις
π(αρά) Αὐρ[ηλ]ίου [. . .]ς
ἀπ[ὸ κώμ]ης Θε[αδε]λφείας
5 [.]ον [] . . μ . [.] . [. .]υς
[. .] . s.
καὶ ἀεὶ [θ]ύων καὶ ἐ[ύσε]βων
τοῖς θε[ο]ῖς διατετέλεκα
καὶ νῦν ἐπὶ παρόντων
10 ὑμῶ[ν] κατὰ τὰ προστε-

ταγ[μέν]α ἔθυσα καὶ ἕσ-
 πεισα [καὶ] τῶν ἱερείων
 ἐγευσά[μ]ην καὶ ἀξιῶ ὑμᾶς
 [ὑ]ποσ[ημ]ιώσα[σθ]αι. διεντυ-

15 χεῖτε. 2d Hand. [Σ]ΕΣΗΜΙ

3rd Hand. Αὐρή(λίοι) [Σερ]ῆνος καὶ Ἑρμᾶς

1st Hand. To the commission chosen to superintend the sacrifices. From Aurelius . . . s of the village of Theadelphia (of the division of Themistes?). I have always and without interruption sacrificed and shown piety to the gods, and now in your presence in accordance with the edict's decree I have made sacrifice, and poured a libation, and partaken of the sacred victims. I request you to certify this below. Farewell.

2d Hand. I certify it.

3d Hand. We, Aurelius Serenus and Aurelius Hermas

NOTES

A REJOINDER BY RABBI KLAUSNER

In the January number of the *Harvard Theological Review* for this year I published a review of the recent "Life of Jesus of Nazareth," by Rabbi Joseph Klausner and of a criticism of the volume by Doctor Kaminka of Vienna.

In a letter from Doctor Klausner he replies to some points in my criticism and restates his own position. It is proper, therefore, that this part of his letter should be put before the readers of the *Review* and Professor Wolfson has been kind enough to translate it for that purpose. Doctor Klausner writes:

"(a) You think that the rejection of Jesus by the Jews was not because his teaching contained anything contradictory to Judaism but rather because at the very outset of his career he assumed the character of a 'Son of God' and a 'Saviour' of the type common in the pagan religions of the times.¹ With this view I cannot agree. What you say is true enough as an answer to the question why the Jews rejected Christianity, but it does not solve the question why the Jews did not recognize Jesus. Already during the lifetime of Jesus the great majority of Jews, and the Pharisees in particular, came out in opposition to him, and this opposition grew in strength immediately after his crucifixion, when the Christian community was still made up of Jews exclusively, at the head of whom stood such Jews as Peter and James, the latter 'the Lord's brother.' Why then did the Jews oppose Jesus and his first disciples, if it were not for the fact that in the very teaching of Jesus there was something non-jewish, or, as I contend, something even anti-jewish?

"(b) Again, you think that the rise of Christianity is to be sought not in the exalted moral teaching of Jesus but rather in his soteriology, which was in the spirit of the pagan religions of the times. The following questions, however, may be asked. How did it happen that of the many Messiahs that appeared toward the end of the second Temple none but Jesus succeeded in establishing a new religion of salvation, and that, in the case of all but Jesus, soon after their execution at the hands of the Romans their pretended Messiahship was

¹ Dr. Klausner has here misunderstood what I said. (G. F. M.)

forgotten and even their names disappeared from the annals of history? Is it not because, as I have tried to explain, Jesus based his theory of redemption upon a moral code which was unique both in its positive and in its negative aspects? In order fully to understand the rise of Christianity one must be not only an archaeologist, not only an historian, but also a student of the philosophy of history. If the pagan idea of redemption was the sole factor (not merely the principal factor) in the rise of Christianity, it would be hard to understand how that idea happened to become attached to the name of Jesus and not to that of any of the other Messiahs, and also why the Jews came out in opposition to Jesus and his disciples even before Paul had given Christianity its semi-pagan character. Furthermore, Paul himself, as long as he remained a Pharisee, persecuted the first Christians, even though they had not yet adopted the partly pagan redemptive creed which he himself developed many years later."

GEORGE F. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

TWO NOTES¹

(1) DICKINSON'S COLLATION OF CODEX BEZAE²

Dickinson's collation of Codex Bezae was used by Scrivener in restoring the torn leaf fol. 504 a-b, and was described by him as "an unpublished collation made about 1732 or 1733 by John Dickinson of S. John's College, for John Jackson of Leicester, for six pounds sterling, now, with Jackson's other books, in the Library of Jesus College, Cambridge (O θ 2)" in a volume "happily lettered 'MS. Sermons.'" The volume in its present condition shows no signs of the old library-mark O θ 2, and a new title has been pasted on the binding: "Collat. of Gr. Test. M.S.S.", probably covering the older one given by Scrivener. The present library-mark is R.2.9.

The title-page reads: *Omnes Variae Lectiones Textus cum Graeci tum Latini celeberrimi illius MS. Cantabrigiensis Novi Testamenti (quod Bezae fuit). Quat. Evang. et Partis 3^{tiae} Epist. Johan. et Act. Apost.*

¹ I would express my gratitude to the Master of Jesus College, Mr. Arthur Gray, and to Professor F. C. Burkitt for their generous assistance, and acknowledge the kind help of my friend Mr. R. A. Bowman in going over the books in the library.

² See J. H. Ropes, 'The Reconstruction of the Torn Leaf of Codex Bezae,' *Harvard Theological Review*, April, 1923, pp. 163-168. [The more perfect knowledge of the statements of Dickinson, which now completes all the available evidence, fortunately does not make necessary any change in my reconstruction. J. H. R.]

collati cum Küsteri Editione Testamenti Milliani Impressi Lypsiæ A.D. 1723. Johannis Dickinson. Another name above that of Dickinson has been carefully blotted out. Two notes by John Jackson are added. Over the title is written: "This Collation cost 6. 0. 0, it is done very exactly, and a great number of var. Lect. of Dr Mill out of this MS. may be corrected by this collation. It contains only those omitted or mistaken by Dr Mill." Below the title appears: "The joynt property of the Revnd Mr Wape Rector of Ayhno in Northampshire and of the Revnd Mr Jackson Master of Wigston's Hospital in Leicester. After ye death of Mr Wape his heir gave me ye whole property of ye MS. J. Jackson." A line at the foot of the page in a third hand reads: "This collation was made about A.D. 1733 by Mr John Dickinson of St John's College, W. I."

After three pages of introduction to the orthography of Codex Bezae the collation begins, and extends from page 3 to page 244. It is of value chiefly for fol. 504, that is, for the Latin text of Acts 21, 7-10 and the Greek text of Acts 21, 16-18. The text of the collation for these verses follows:

[Acts 21, 7-10]

7

Nos autem navigatione expedita a Tyro venimus Ptolemaidem et salutavimus Fratres — apud eos —

8.9.

Sequenti cum exissemus venimus Caesaream et cum introissemus in domum Philippi (hic mutilatur Pag.) neglistae . . . de septem mansimus ad eum . . . filiae IIII virgines . . . eam — Desiderantur caetera horum trium versuum —

προφητης cum hoc verbo incip. P. G. Profeta —

.

16-17-18

— απο (sic stat, quid antea nescio). Κεσαραιας (secundo a eraso — fecit Man. Recentior παρ ω ξενισθωμεν — Νασωνι (M supra) — alia verba lacerantur. κω (μην enim non apparet) nec τινι κυπριω — De Caesarea nobis cum simulquae adduxerunt nos apud quem ospitemur et cum venerunt in quendam Civitatem fuimus ad Nasonem quendam discipulum antiquum et inde exeuntes &c juxta Mill. — introibit — post Jacobum manus paulo recentior scripsit omnes — Μαθητη αρχαιω — post υποδειξαντο in lacerata Pag. habetur τη δε — πρεσβυτεροι συνηγμενοι — erant autem cum eo Presbyteri conventi —

Comparison with Scrivener's text of Dickinson's Collation shows the former to be inaccurate at several points. In vs. 17 Scrivener reads *υπεδεξαντο* for the collator's erroneous *υποδειξαντο* (cf. Ussher's collation), and in vs. 16 he does not make it clear that Dickinson wrote *απο* (following the ancient corrector) and not *εκ*. It is remarkable also that Scrivener's extracts from the collation, "manus recentior ω" in vs. 16, and "nam *μην* non apparet, nec *τινι κυπριω*" in vs. 16, are not exact, which occasions the suspicion that Scrivener did not himself copy the original.

(2) THE "LOST" CODEX 106 OF THE GOSPELS

Codex 106^{evv} (Gregory, *Prolegomena*, p. 491; *Textkritik*, p. 152) has been supposed lost. It belonged in the 18th century to the Earl of Winchilsea, and was kept at Burley-on-the-Hill, near Oakham, Rutlandshire. Gregory's description of it is taken from Wetstein, who knew it through a copy of a collation by John Jackson, brought to the Continent by César de Missy.³ Gregory's attempt to trace the MS. in England was without result, and he reported it lost. In his revised list of New Testament MSS. he dropped it altogether, and transferred the symbol 106 to another MS. of the gospels.⁴ The distinguishing feature of Codex Winchilseanus was supposed to be an Arabic marginal note explaining *παρασκευή* in Matt. 26, 62. Wetstein believed the text to be related to the Philoxenian Syriac.

In the Library of Jesus College, Cambridge, is a bound note-book with the title "Codex Burleiensis" printed on the binding, together with the date 1745. Its library mark is Q.7.7. It contains collations not only of the Codex Burleiensis but also of the Old Latin, made from Bianchini's edition of 1748, of the Gothic version from Benzell's edition, and of the Codex Bezae (extending only through the Gospel of Matthew). It came into the possession of Jesus College Library with the Dickinson collation and the other books of John Jackson.⁵

³ J. J. Wetstein, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, 1751; *Prolegomena*, p. 58. It seems probable from Michaelis's account that de Missy's collation was a copy of Jackson's. To it Wetstein must have added, either from the MS. itself or from hearsay, knowledge of the Arabic note, for no mention is made of this in Jackson's collation. See J. D. Michaelis, *Introduction to the New Testament*, English translation with notes by Herbert Marsh, Cambridge, 1793, vol. II, 1, p. 359; vol. II, 2, p. 826.

⁴ C. R. Gregory, *Textkritik des N. T.*, vol. III, p. 1097; *Die griechischen Handschriften des N. T.*, Leipzig, 1908, pp. 52, 200.

⁵ John Sutton, *Memoirs of the Life and Writings of the late Reverend Mr. John Jackson*, London, 1764, pp. 257 ff.

W. H. M. Finch, Esq., the present owner of Burley-on-the-Hill, consented to look through his library for the Codex Burleiensis, found it, and very kindly sent it to Cambridge. The identity of this MS. with that from which Jackson's collation was made was easily established by comparison of a number of characteristic readings, such as Matt. 14, 18; 24, 31; Mark 6, 36; 10, 29; 14, 31; 14, 69; Luke 12, 51, as well as from the superscription of the collation.⁶ The following description corrects and supplements that of Gregory, employing the same arrangement and abbreviations which he used in the Prolegomena to Tischendorf.

106. Burley-on-the-Hill, prope Oakham, sedem antiquam comitum de Winchilsea, penes v. cl. W. H. M. Finch.

saecl. X, 37 × 20.5, membr, foll. 212, col. 1, ll. 22, litt mai rubr; ι adscriptum, aliquotiens ubi non debet esse (e.g., ηι Βασιλεια Mt 6, 10; ελθεται Le 11, 2); Carp. prol, capp-tab, capp, titl, sect (Mc 241), can, subscr, σελχ Mt vac, Mc 1600, Le 2800, Ioh 2300), pict (man Ioh Proch), lect m. ser: *Evv*; Mt 25, 40-26, 37, Mc 11, 14-33 mut; adult deest, sed textus est Byzantinus et rarissime cum B vel D congruit.

The text seems to have no special connection with the Harclean or any Syriac version; its text is ordinary Constantinopolitan, very near the so-called Textus Receptus.

There is no Arabic gloss to παρασκευή, Matt. 27, 62; what stands in the margin is 11B, followed by the Arabic for '12th,' the only Arabic marginal notes in the book, apart from certain words on the fly-leaf, being the numbers of the usual twelve Gospels for the Passion.⁷

On the front fly-leaf is a scrawl in red crayon, and at the back a page of writing. They are in barbarous modern Greek and for the most part unintelligible. At one point the date 1668 is clear, and at another it appears that the MS. was once the property of the Frankish church at Constantinople. Both facts confirm the natural assumption that the MS. was brought to England by Heneage Finch, second earl of Winchilsea,⁸ who was ambassador at Constantinople, 1661-1669. At the top of the back fly-leaf a few lines of Arabic have been written

⁶ An D. 1745. Var. Lect. Codicis MS. membranei ex Bibliotheca Burleensi nobilissimi comitis de Winchilsea numquam antea descripti. Codex exaratus videtur (quantum ex forma literarum et aliis indicibus conjectare licet) circiter medium decimi seculi octingentis abhinc annis.

⁷ I am indebted to Professor Burkitt for this description of the MS.

⁸ Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XIX, p. 11.

by a very late hand: "O Lord, have mercy on thy servant, the sinner the deacon Satama, son of the priest Peter. Hajji Mansur, may God Almighty have mercy on him, from S . . ." This 'lost' manuscript is now where it has always been since the 17th century, at Burley-on-the-Hill, near Oakham.

ROBERT PIERCE CASEY.

JESUS COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

A LOST MANUSCRIPT OF EUSEBIUS'S DEMONSTRATIO EVANGELICA FOUND

The textual condition of the *Demonstratio Evangelica* of Eusebius is unfortunately very defective. The only existing manuscripts appear to be copies of the great Paris codex 469, and the beginning and end of this manuscript are now missing. Fortunately a MS. which contained the parts in question was used by Fabricius in the eighteenth century, and another of the thirteenth century is extant, Codex Bononianus 3644, which likewise has the missing lines. The manuscript used by Fabricius is generally known as Codex Maurocordati because it was in the hands of Prince Mavrogordato when Fabricius used it, but it has never been seen from that time until the present.

It appears, however, from the catalogue of the Vatopedi library on Mt. Athos, which will shortly be published as Number XI of the Harvard Theological Studies, that this codex is in the monastery of Vatopedi. This can be seen clearly by comparing what Fabricius says about his manuscript with a note at the end of the Vatopedi codex 179. Fabricius' statement is as follows: *Singulari autem beneficio celsissimi ac sapientissimi Walachiae principis Maurocordati atque illustrissimi eius propinqui et archicamerarii Johannis Scarlati mihi contigit ut proxeneta C. V. Stephano Berglero licuerit mihi ex integriore codice, quem Graecia servavit principique obtulit, defectum illum ingentem initio libri primi supplere decimique finem ubi perpauca desiderabantur subnectere.* The note at the end of the Vatopedi codex is as follows: τὸ παρὸν βιβλίον ἐδωρήθη παρὰ τοῖς πατράσι τῆς ἱερᾶς καὶ βασιλικῆς μονῆς τοῦ Βατοπαιδίου τῷ ὑψηλοτάτῳ αἰθέντῃ κυρ Ἰωάννῃ Νικολάῳ Ἀλεξάνδρου Μαυροκορδάτου παρ' ἐμοῦ ταπεινοῦ μητροπολίτου Νύσσης Νεοφύτου διὰ τὰ μένῃ εἰς τὴν βιβλιοθήκην τῆς αὐτοῦ ὑψηλότητος ,αψκγ' [1723] Αὐγούστου α' Νεόφυτος. There can therefore be no doubt that the

Codex Maurocordati is Codex Vatopedi 179, that it was never in the ownership of Prince Mavrogordato but was lent to him by the monks and (what is a remarkable and almost unique circumstance) returned to them after he had finished with it.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

THE DATE OF THE SLAVONIC ENOCH

G. Nathanael Bonwetsch. *Die Bücher der Geheimnisse Henochs. (Texte und Untersuchungen, 44, 2).* Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1922.

In this edition of *The Secrets of Enoch* in "Texte und Untersuchungen," 44, 2, Professor Bonwetsch has provided a new translation of the Slavonic text, with an apparatus criticus of all known materials. He shows that there are two recensions of the text, of which the longer, known as A, is not an expansion of the shorter, and that the shorter, B, is an epitome of the original. Both these recensions are therefore derived from an original Slavonic translation of a lost Greek text, of which no trace remains.

From the point of view of translation and apparatus, so far as it is possible to judge without being able to compare the original Slavonic, Bonwetsch's book is — as his reputation would lead us to expect — all that could be desired, but it is doubtful whether the fourth paragraph of the Introduction, which deals with the use of the *Secrets of Enoch* possibly made in other books, is sufficiently full to be satisfactory, and in the sixth paragraph one point, which is passed over in a few cryptic lines, is of such value for the dating of the book that it is perhaps not undesirable to draw renewed attention to it.

On page XIX, Bonwetsch says, "Über die kalendarischen Angaben des slav. Henochbuches handelt Charles im Journal of Theological Studies, Januar 1921, gegenüber den Ausführungen von Mrs. Maunder in 'The Observatory 41' (1918), 309-316." This veiled reference is to one of the most interesting contributions to our knowledge of apocryphal literature which has ever been made by a student of a sister science. In "The Observatory" for October 1918 Mrs. Maunder drew attention to the references to the calendar in the Slavonic *Enoch*, and suggested that the knowledge of astronomical systems which they implied was impossible at the early date which Charles had suggested, or rather postulated, for the book. This called forth,

nearly three years later, a reply from Dr. Charles (Journal of Theological Studies, January, 1921) in which he attempted to put her statements on one side and suggested to her — much as an earlier theologian did to Galileo — that astronomers were incapable of understanding theological and critical points. However, in the October number of the Journal of Theological Studies for the same year, Dr. J. K. Fotheringham restated Mrs. Maunder's case as against Dr. Charles, and seemed to show that Mrs. Maunder is supported by the facts. It would be impossible here to reproduce all the arguments in his closely written and extremely lucid article, but the decisive paragraph is the following:

In dating the calendrical chapters of the Slavonic Enoch we have to consider not merely the dates when the different calendrical elements contained in them made their first appearance, but also their relation to one another. It will be clear from this résumé that they not merely give *termini a quo*, of which the latest falls in the seventh century, but that they all form part of the Easter *computus* as developed in that century. In fact they contain the complete scheme by which the week, the solar year, and the lunar month were combined by the computists from that time onwards. They do not contain the feast of Easter itself, which would be an anachronism in a book attributed to Enoch. It seems clear that either the whole of the astronomy of the book is an interpolation, or the book was written many centuries later than Dr. Charles supposes. The former alternative is difficult, because the astronomical section appears to be an integral part of the whole, as Mrs. Maunder points out. If the latter alternative also presents difficulties, I must leave their solution to more competent scholars than myself, who may be trusted to do justice to the strong case that Mrs. Maunder has made out.

I can see no loophole of escape from this contention. It is as convincing evidence as has ever been produced for the dating of a document of uncertain origin, and shows that the Secrets of Enoch is not a book of the early Jewish apocalyptic period but a much later fabrication not earlier than the seventh century. The argument seems entirely conclusive, and weighs far more strongly than supposed references to the Secrets of Enoch in earlier literature.

KIRSOPP LAKE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

- LA BIBLE DU CENTENAIRE. Tome II, Première Livraison; JOSUÉ, Juges 1-20, 9. Société Biblique de Paris, 1923. 80 pp. 160 francs.
- HUMAN AUSTRALASIA: STUDIES OF SOCIETY AND OF EDUCATION IN AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND. *By Charles Franklin Thwing.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. 270. \$2.50.
- A DICTIONARY OF RELIGION AND ETHICS. *Edited by Shailer Mathews and Gerald Birney Smith.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. vii, 513. Reprint edition. \$3.00.
- FOLK-LORE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT: STUDIES IN COMPARATIVE RELIGION, LEGEND, AND LAW. *By James G. Frazer.* Abridged edition. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. xxx, 476. \$5.00.
- THE GOLDEN BOUGH: A STUDY IN MAGIC AND RELIGION. *By James G. Frazer.* 1 volume, abridged edition. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. xiv, 752. \$5.00.
- MORAL VALUES AND THE IDEA OF GOD. GIFFORD LECTURES, ABERDEEN, 1914-1915. *By W. R. Sorley.* Second edition. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1921. Pp. xix, 527.
- THE CAMBRIDGE ANCIENT HISTORY. Volume I, Egypt and Babylonia. *Edited by J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock.* New York, The Macmillan Co., 1923. Pp. xxii, 704. \$8.50.
- CHILDREN OF THE WAY. *By Anne C. E. Allinson.* New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co. [1923]. Pp. 193. \$1.75.
- SOME ASPECTS OF THE LIFE OF JESUS FROM THE PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PSYCHOANALYTICAL POINT OF VIEW. *By Georges Berguer.* Translated by Eleanor and Van Wyck Brooks. New York, Harcourt, Brace and Co. [1923]. Pp. viii, 332. \$3.50.
- THE CONSTRUCTIVE REVOLUTION OF JESUS. *By Samuel Dickey.* New York, George H. Doran Company, [1923]. Pp. 165. \$1.60.
- THE CULTS OF CAMPANIA (Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome). *By Merle Peterson.* Vol. I. American Academy in Rome. 1919. Pp. vii, 403.
- HENRY LOOMIS, FRIEND OF THE EAST. *By Clara Denison Loomis.* New York, Fleming H. Revell Company, 1923. Pp. 150.
- RELIGIONE E POLITICA NELL' IMPERO ROMANO. *By G. Costa.* Turin, Fratelli Bocca Editori, 1923. Pp. ix, 332.
- ΕΤΧΑΡΙΣΤΗΡΙΟΝ. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments, Hermann Gunkel, zum 60. Geburtstage, dem 23. Mai 1922 dargebracht von seinen Schülern und Freunden. I. Teil (zum Alten Testament). II. Teil (zum Neuen Testament). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1923. Pp. vi, 425; 240.
- AMERICAN THOUGHT FROM PURITANISM TO PRAGMATISM AND BEYOND. *By Woodbridge Riley.* New York, Henry Holt and Co., 1923. Pp. x, 438. \$2.00.

HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

- ARCHIVES FROM ERECH, TIME OF NEBUCHADREZZAR AND NABONIDUS. *By Raymond Philip Dougherty.* (Goucher College Cuneiform Inscriptions, Vol. 1.) New Haven, Yale University Press, 1923. Pp. 67. Plates 56.
- CENTURY READINGS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. *Edited by John W. Cunliffe and Henry M. Battenhouse.* New York, The Century Co., 1923. Pp. xiv, 384. \$2.00.
- DIE ERKENNTNISLEHRE DES JOHANNES ERIUGENA. *By Artur Schneider.* Berlin and Leipzig, Walter de Gruyter & Co., 1921-1923. Pp. 128. 1 Goldmark.
- THE EXODUS IN THE LIGHT OF ARCHÆOLOGY. *By J. S. Griffiths.* London, Robert Scott, 1923. Pp. 79. 2s. 6d.
- NATURE AND HUMAN NATURE. *By Hartley Burr Alexander.* Chicago, The Open Court Publishing Company, 1923. Pp. ix, 529. \$3.00.
- THE THIRTEEN PRINCIPAL UPANISHADS TRANSLATED FROM THE SANSKRIT WITH AN OUTLINE OF THE PHILOSOPHY OF THE UPANISHADS AND AN ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY. *By Robert Ernest Hume.* London, Oxford University Press, 1921. Pp. xvi, 539. 15s.
- JESUS AND THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION. *By Francis A. Henry.* 2d edition, revised. New York, London, G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1923. Pp. iii, 452.
- RELIGION AND MODERN INDIA. *By Satis Chandra Roy.* Calcutta, Asutosh Dhar, Asutosh Library. 1923. Pp. xxxvi, 365.

Baptist. Wm. Sch.